University of Texas Bulletin
No. 2411: March 15, 1924

STUDIES IN ENGLISH

Number 4

PUBLISHED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
AUSTIN

Publications of the University of Texas

The University publishes bulletins four times a month, so numbered that the first two digits of the number show the year of issue, the last two the position in the yearly series. (For example, No. 2201 is the first bulletin of the year 1922.) These comprise the official publications of the University, publications on humanistic and scientific subjects, bulletins prepared by the Bureau of Extension, by the Bureau of Economic Geology, and other bulletins of general educational interest. With the exception of special numbers, any bulletin will be sent to a citizen of Texas free on request. All communications about University publications should be addressed to University Publications, University of Texas, Austin.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS PRESS, AUSTIN

University of Texas Bulletin
No. 2411: March 15, 1924

STUDIES IN ENGLISH

Number 4

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY FOUR TIMES A MONTH, AND ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER AT THE POSTOFFICE AT AUSTIN, TEXAS, UNDER THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912

The benefits of education and of useful knowledge, generally diffused through a community, are essential to the preservation of a free government.

Sam Houston

Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. . . . It is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge and the only security that freemen desire.

Mirabeau B. Lamar

CONTENTS

SPENSER'S USE OF IRISH HISTORY IN THE *VEUE OF THE PRESENT STATE OF IRELAND*

By Frank F. Covington, Jr.

At least sixteen of the last eighteen years of Spenser's life were spent in Ireland. From 1580, when he accompanied Lord Grey, as secretary, to the "salvage island," until 1599, the year of his death, the author of the *Faerie Queene* lived his life, except for two visits to England, of perhaps a year's duration each, in the country to which fortune rather than inclination called him. For more than half of that time he was connected with the administration, in one or another official capacity. That during those years he must have become acquainted with the history of the country in which he lived is a reasonable assumption. There is ample testimony, indeed, that he was keenly interested in Irish affairs, as witness the political allegory in the *Faerie Queene,* which editors and critics since the time of Upton have been busily interpreting, and the elaborate discussion of the Irish problem in the *Veue of the Present State of Ireland.*

But the extent of Spenser's knowledge of his Irish environment has never been more than fragmentarily investigated. Such studies on this subject as have appeared have been concerned mainly with the interpretation of the allegory in the passages of the *Faerie Queene* in which clear reference or veiled allusion is made to Ireland. Detailed account of these would be out of place here; suffice it to say that their results seem to show that there are undeniably allusions in Spenser's long allegorical poem to events in the history of Ireland. The greater number of these are naturally found in Book V, the theme of which is, in large part, the rescue of Ireland from the aggressions of Spain and the spirit of rebellion. Still better testimony, however, to the fact that Spenser had some knowledge of Irish history is found in the *Veue.* In this tract, which is a mine of information, as yet largely unworked, concerning Spenser's knowledge of and attitude toward Ireland, both legendary

and authentic Irish history are employed in close connection with the author's discussion of Ireland's "evils" and of their cure. If we can arrive at some conclusions, even tentative ones, as to what Spenser knew of Ireland's past, and where he got his information, we shall perhaps be able to throw a little light on the problems of Spenser's relation to his environment and his use of sources in general. The aim of this paper is to present material which will help to answer the questions: (1) What did Spenser know about Irish history? (2) What were his sources? (3) What was his attitude toward his sources? and (4) What was his method in his treatment of his material?

I

The legendary history of Ireland is briefly alluded to in the two passages in the *Faerie Queene* in which the chronicles of the early British kings are set forth,—that is, in the tenth canto of Book II and in the third canto of Book III. In these we find Ireland mentioned in connection with the alleged conquests of the early hero-kings of England. In the forty-first stanza of the first-mentioned canto we find an account of Gurgunt, who, according to Spenser, had dominion over Ireland.

> "Next them did Gurgunt, great Belinus sonne,
> In rule succeede, and eke in fathers praise:
> He Easterland subdewd, and Denmarke wonne,
> And of them both did foy and tribute raise,
> The which was dew in his dead fathers daies.
> He also gave to fugitives of Spayne,
> Whom he at sea found wandering from their waies,
> A seate in Ireland safely to remayne,
> Which they should hold of him, as subject to Britayne."[1]

The other reference to Ireland is found in the thirty-third stanza of the other canto.

> "All which his sonne Careticus awhile
> Shall well defend, and Saxons powre suppresse,
> Untill a straunger king, from unknowne soyle

[1]Quoted from the Cambridge edition of Spenser's poems, p. 301. The Globe edition has "Gurgiunt."

Arriving, him with multitude oppresse;
Great Gormond, having with huge mightinesse
Ireland subdewd, and therein fixt his throne,
Like a swift otter, fell through emptiness,
Shall overswim the sea with many one
Of his Norveyses, to assist the Britons fone."

Spenser's chief source for these two passages was Geoffrey of Monmouth; but he was influenced also by Holinshed. These facts have been demonstrated by Miss Carrie A. Harper, in her monograph, "The Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser's Faerie Queene,"[2] in which she examines all the possible sources upon which Spenser could have drawn for his statements in these two cantos concerning the early British kings, and points out those to which he was most indebted. Her conclusions concerning both Spenser's sources and his methods of using them are very interesting and quite to our present purpose. She finds, in the first place, that "much of Spenser's chronicle material agrees in detail as well as in general outline with Geoffrey's *Historia*";[3] in the second place, that "Spenser occasionally drew from Caxton, Grafton, Camden, Lloyd, the *Tragedy of Gorboduc,* and possibly also from Nennius and Warner; and frequently was influenced by Harding, Stow, the *Mirror for Magistrates,* and Holinshed";[4] and "in the third place that in a single passage Spenser often drew from several authorities."[5]

Miss Harper finds, furthermore, two characteristics in Spenser's treatment of his sources worth noting. "The first is that no statement is made doubtfully . . . . We always seem to be dealing with unquestionable fact. The

---

[2]Bryn Mawr, 1910. See pp. 96-98 and 151-152. For the first passage, Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Regum Britanniae,* ed. San Marte, Halle, 1854, III, 11-12, pp. 39-40; Holinshed, 1577, p. 21, *ibid.,* 1587, *First Inhabitation of Ireland,* (vol. II) p. 58; for the second, G. of M., XI, 8, pp. 159-160, Hol., *Hist.* (1577), pp. 144 ff., *Hist. of Ireland,* pp. 14, 16.

[3]*Op. cit..,* p. 172.

[4]*Ibid.,* p. 177.

[5]*Ibid.,* p. 178.

second characteristic is that the story is told strictly from the British point of view."[6]

Briefly, then, Miss Harper's conclusions are that Spenser followed in the main one authority, but consulted all that had any bearing on the subject, and at times made his narrative a composite from more than one source; that he used his sources uncritically; and that he displayed in his narrative thoroughgoing patriotism. These conclusions are, generally speaking, true of his study and employment of Irish history.

With regard to his sources, however, our findings will be different. The authorities upon which he could draw for facts about Ireland, historical or otherwise, were much fewer than those cited in Miss Harper's study of the *Faerie Queene*. In histories of England in Spenser's time, Ireland was mentioned only incidentally and briefly. There were, however, several works giving or pretending to give the chief facts about Irish history, and with all of these Spenser seems to have been more or less familiar.

The standard work on Ireland in the sixteenth century was comprised in the two books of the Anglo-Norman Gerald de Barri, better known as Giraldus Cambrensis, the *Topographia Hiberniae* and the *Expugnatio Hiberniae*.[7] These, written in Latin in the twelfth century, purported to give a detailed description of Ireland, and an account of the "conquest" of the country in the reign of King Henry II of England. In spite of the manifest errors of prejudice and observation of the one and the limited historical scope of the other, they remained for centuries the authoritative works on Ireland. When the new and enlarged edition of Holinshed was issued in 1587, it was thought necessary to include as a part of the account of Ireland a translation of

---

[6]*Ibid.*, pp. 180-81.

[7]Printed in the *Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages* ("Rolls Series'), ed. by J. F. Dimock. There is a translation in the Bohn Library.

the *Expugnatio,* under the title of "The Conquest of Ireland."[8]

In the sixteenth century renewed interest in England's troubled dependency gave rise to the composition of independent and more complete works on Ireland. The first of these seems to have been a sketch by the Jesuit Edmund Campion, which, dignified by the title of "Historie of Ireland," was written in 1571. This was a compilation itself owing much to Giraldus, but bringing the compass of the history down to the date of composition. It was not printed, apparently, until 1633.[9] In 1584 one Richard Stanihurst or Stanyhurst, a native and resident of Ireland, published at Antwerp a Latin work on Ireland entitled *De Rebus in Hibernia Gestis.*[10] It is based largely on the works of Giraldus, and adds little to the historical data adduced by that author. In 1586 appeared the first edition of William Camden's *Britannia,* which contained a brief account of Ireland and the Irish, including some historical material.[11]

In the same year appeared George Buchanan's *Rerum Scoticarum Historiae,* a work of great learning and some acumen, in which the early colonizations of Scotland and Ireland are discussed at considerable length. In general,

---

[8]Since the 1577 and 1587 editions of Holinshed are not easily accessible, I have quoted from the reprint of 1808, which is apparently based on the edition of 1587.

[9]By Sir James Ware, the noted Irish antiquarian; and reprinted with Ware's notes in 1809, at Dublin, together with Spenser's *Veue,* Hanmer's *History,* and Marlburrough's *Chronicles.* It is from this edition—*Ancient Irish Histories*—that quotations are made in this paper. The earlier edition is rare and not easily accessible.

According to the *Dictionary of National Biography,* Campion's work was printed by Stanihurst in the second edition of Holinshed (1587); but this is clearly an error. Stanihurst borrowed from the *Historie* very freely but without acknowledgment.

[10]Apparently never reprinted.

[11]Besides the first edition, at least two others appeared in Spenser's life-time. There is some evidence that Spenser used the edition of 1594.

the affairs of Ireland receive attention only in so far as they are related to those of Scotland.[12]

The next year the second edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles* was brought out. In this edition the section devoted to Ireland included not only the translation of Giraldus's *Expugnatio* but an account of early Ireland by Stanihurst, and a narrative of Ireland's history from the events related by Giraldus to the year 1586 by one John Hooker, or Vowell.

These (excluding Campion) were the authorities upon which Spenser had to depend for his information about Irish history, so far as printed sources were available. Since the material in Holinshed was the most comprehensive and detailed, Spenser naturally turned to this work as his main source. Holinshed, then, was Spenser's chief authority for the facts of Irish history as set forth in the *Veue of the Present State of Ireland,* as will be presently shown.[13]

There is evidence, however, not always conclusive but strongly suggestive, that Spenser was acquainted with and consulted the other authorities also. Whether or not he knew Giraldus Cambrensis in the original Latin is not certain, but he must have read the translation of the *Expugnatio* in Holinshed. It is hardly likely that he would have neglected a work of such reputation, especially since the Anglo-Norman writer is acknowledged by Campion and Stanihurst as an important source. Campion's work, as we have just seen, was not accessible to Spenser in print, but it is possible that he read it in manuscript. It was certainly well known to Stanihurst, who incorporated numerous passages from it in his contribution to Holinshed's

---

[12]An edition edited by the Scottish scholar Ruddiman was published at Leyden, in 1725. Through the courtesy of Professor J. M. Berdan, of Yale University, I have been able to make use of this edition. For the general reader, a convenient edition is that in English, published at Glasgow in 1827, translated and edited by James Aikman.

[13]Prof. Edwin Greenlaw ("Spenser and British Imperialism," *Mod. Philol.*, IX (1912), pp. 347ff.) points out Spenser's indebtedness in the *Veue* to Holinshed.

Chronicles. That a number of manuscript copies of a pioneer work on Irish history should have been in circulation in Ireland during Spenser's residence there is highly probable. The popularity of treatises on Irish subjects at this time is attested by the number of extant manuscripts of the *Veue of the Present State of Ireland.* That Spenser did consult Campion's work is suggested by a passage in the *Veue* in his discussion of the degeneration of the "old English" families in Ireland into "wild Irish." As an illustration of his contention he cites the cases of the Butlers and the Geraldines, whose quarrels led to the subversion of English power in Ireland. "This ye may see playnely discovered," says Irenaeus, the chief interlocutor of the dialogue, "by a letter written from the cittizens of Corke out of Ireland to the Earle of Shrewsbury then in England, and remayning yet upon record, both in the Towre of London, and also amongest the Chronicles of Ireland."[14] Now if we turn to Holinshed, Spenser's usual authority, we find, in both the 1577 and the 1587 edition, an account of a similar letter, not from Cork, but from Richard, Duke of York, addressed to the Earl of *Salisbury,* not Shrewsbury.[15] Since Shrewsbury and Salisbury are much alike, an error in transcription may be responsible for the form used by Spenser. But examination of Campion suggests the solution. On pages 139-142 of Ware's edition of Campion[16] is reproduced a letter said to have been written in the reign of Henry IV by "the inhabitants of the country and towne

---

[14]Globe edition of *Spenser,* p. 636. The *Veue* is in the form of a dialogue between Irenaeus, an Englishman, just returned from Ireland, and Eudoxus, an Englishman resident in England. I have quoted from the Globe text, for the sake of convenient reference.

[15]This fact was verified for me by research in the Harvard Library; the page reference in the 1587 ed. was not supplied. In the 1577 ed. the letter is found in I, p. 73; in the 1808 ed. it is in VI, p. 267.

[16]*Anc. Irish Hist.,* Dublin, 1809, I. Campion's *Historie* follows the *Veue,* with separate pagination. The validity of this contention depends, of course, on the accuracy of this text. I have been unable to consult the 1633 edition.

of Corke" to the then Lord Deputy. According to a footnote on page 139 this letter was "copied out of an old Record bearing no date." A few pages further on (p. 146) another letter is reproduced, this from Richard Duke of York, "To the right worshipfull and with all my heart entirely beloved brother, the Earle of Shrewsbury." This latter passage is apparently the source of Spenser's *Shrewsbury*. The explanation of Spenser's blunder probably is that, depending on his memory (as he often did) for his data in this instance, he confused the two letters he recalled having read in Campion, attributing the destination of the second letter to the first. If Holinshed had been his source, he would have used presumably the name there given, "Salisbury."[17]

That Spenser read Stanihurst's *De Rebus* is suggested by a passage in the *Veue* in which he criticizes the Irish writer for carelessness and misinformation. After Irenaeus has called attention to a common Irish war-cry, "Ferragh,"[18] as evidence of the Scottish or Scythian origin of the Irish race, Eudoxus, the other interlocutor in the dialogue, replies:

"Believe me, this observation of yours, Irenaeus, is very good and delightfull; farr beyond the blunt conceit of some, who (I remember) have upon the same woord Ferragh, made a very gross conjecture; as namely Mr. Stanihurst, who though he be the same country man borne, that should searche more neerely into the secrett of these thinges, yet hath strayed from the trueth all the heavens wide (as they say) for he thereupon groundeth a very gross imagination, that the Irish should discend from the Aegyptians which came into that iland, first under the leading of one Scota the daughter of Pharao, wherupon they use (sayeth he) in all theyr battells to call upon

[17]Campion was evidently Holinshed's (more exactly Stanihurst's) source, as a collation of the passages in the two texts will show.

[18]Globe ed., p. 632. I have substituted the spelling of Ware's and Grosart's texts in preference to that of the Globe, "Farrih." The form "Ferragh" is more likely to have been what Spenser wrote, since it is nearer to the names "Fergus," and "Ferragus," which Spenser considers the origin of the war-cry. On this point see "Another View of Spenser's Linguistics," *Studies in Philology* (April, 1922), XIX, 245-246.

the name of Pharao, crying Ferragh, Ferragh.[19] Surely he shootes wyde on the bowe hand, and very farr from the marke. For I would first knowe of him what auncient ground of authoritye he hath for such a senceless fable, and yf he found it in any of the rude Irish bookes, as it may be he had, yet (me seemes) that a man of his learning should not soe lightly have bene carryed away with old wives tales from approovance of his owne reason; for whether Scota be an Aegyptian woord or smacke of any learning or judgement lett the learned judge. But this Scota cometh rather of the Greeke *scotos*, that is, darkness, which hath not lett him see the light of the trueth."[20]

There are three indications in the foregoing passage that point to an acquaintance on the part of Spenser with Stanihurst's Latin work, as well as with that writer's contribution to Holinshed. In the first place he mentions "Mr. Stanihurst," not Holinshed, as being responsible for the blunders cited. Secondly, the mention of the Irish war-cry occurs in the *De Rebus*, but not in Holinshed. The passage to which Spenser takes exception is probably the following:

"Totus autem tam equitatus, quam peditatus, quoties ad manus & pugnam venitur, alta voce, PHARRO, PHARRO, inclamat. Utrum a rege Pharaone, Gandeli socero, an ab alia caussa [sic] clamor iste natus, parum ad rem attinet explicare."[21]

Camden, it is true, mentions this cry among the Irish "mores."

"In bello pro tuba tibia utriculari in usu est, ligaturas portant, preculas recitant, & in congressu *Pharroh* quam acerrime clamant . . . "[22]

Stanihurst, however, was almost certainly Spenser's source, as he probably was Camden's. That Spenser either did not read the passage carefully, or that he was depending upon a defective memory, is almost equally clear, for the Irish writer does not assert that the name of the Egyptian king was the origin of the war-cry; he merely suggests

---

[19]Globe ed. "Farrih, Farrih" (p. 632).
[20]Globe ed., pp. 632-33.
[21]*Op. cit.*, p. 43.
[22]*Britannia*, ed. 1586, p. 523; ed. 1600, p. 791.

it. Finally, for Spenser's whimsical derivation of the name Scota from the Greek σκὸτος he was probably indebted to *De Rebus*. Here again we find in Camden a passage somewhat similar to that in Stanihurst; but the evidence seems to point to the *De Rebus* as Spenser's source. In a discussion (too long to quote here) concerning the supposed origin of the name Scotia (an old name of Scotland, according to some authorities), the Irish writer rejects one of the current opinions:

"Subinsulsa est eorum opinio, qui verbi vim Graecas litteras revocantes, a vocula, σκὸτος quod obscuritatis tenebris fuerit opacata, insulam nominari confirmat, . . ."[23]

Camden has the following:

"Sed ut haec opinio [that the Scots received their name from Scota, daughter of Pharaoh] e superstitione & imperitia rudis antiquitatis enata, etiam a candidioribus Scotis reijcitur, ita altera illa recentior a Graeco fonte deducta, quod Scoti dicantur quasi σκὸτιοι, i. furto concepti, ut in gentis fortissimae contumeliam ab invidis excogitata, mihi prorsus exploditur."[24]

Spenser's use of the form σκὸτος, and his relating it to the meaning "darkness," suggest that Stanihurst was his source.

Before proceeding to the demonstration of Spenser's indebtedness to Holinshed, Camden, and Buchanan, there remains to be considered one other possible source for his knowledge of Irish history, a source which he hinted at in the passage from the *Veue* just quoted: the "rude Irish bookes." These were, of course, the Irish chronicles, which were continuous historical narratives written in the Irish language giving, like the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, year by year the principal events in Ireland, or in so much of Ireland as came within the purview of the chronicler. The most important of these works are the Annals of Ulster, the Annals of Boyle, the Annals of Clonmacnoise, the Annals of Loch Cé, and the so-called "Annals of the Four Mas-

---

[23]Stanihurst, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

[24]*Britannia*, ed. 1586, p. 35; ed. 1600, p. 88.

ters" (in Irish, "Annala Rioghachta Eireann").[25] The earlier parts of these works, which gave fabulous accounts of ancient heroes and early migrations, were naturally open to grave suspicion, and the incomplete knowledge of them by the English gave rise to an attitude of contemptuous skepticism. In addition to these there were in Spenser's time still extant local chronicles and records in churches and monasteries. Spenser apparently shared the current English prejudice against all Irish writings, as well as the prevailing ignorance among the English of the Irish language. If, then, Spenser could not read the Irish chronicles, and would not have believed them if he could have read them, the presumption is naturally that he did not draw upon Irish sources. And yet there is evidence that he was acquainted with both Irish writings and Irish tradition. This evidence is found first in his own statement (if we may accept Irenaeus in the *Veue* as the author's spokesman) that he obtained certain facts about Ireland from Irish families; secondly, in his defence (quàlified and limited, it is true) of the Irish chronicles; and thirdly, in his use of certain data in the *Veue* relating to Ireland which he could not have found in his regular printed authorities.

In this discussion of the rebellion of the Earl of Tyrone, Eudoxus asks for information concerning the right of the rebellious Irish chieftain Feagh McHugh O'Byrne, to the lands he was then holding. Irenaeus accedes to the request, and adds: "I will not only discover the first beginning of his privat howse, but also the originall of all his sept [clan] of the Birnes and Tooles, so farre as I have learned the same from some of themselves, and gathered the rest by reading; . . . ."[26] This seems to mean that Spenser through association with members of these two important clans was able to secure, and was interested enough to secure, genealogical data from them; and that in addition he

[25]The "Annals of Loch Cè" have been published in the Rolls Series. The "Annals of the Four Masters" were published, with introduction and critical apparatus, in 1851.

[26]Globe ed., p. 659.

consulted historical works for the same purpose. What these were it is impossible to say; but it is probable that detailed accounts of Irish families would be found only in Irish writings,—in particular, in the chronicles.

Spenser's defence of these works is found in his discussion of Irish origins. Irenaeus, after explaining to Eudoxus that both Scotland and Ireland had been colonized in early times by the race of Scots, proceeds to show that another "nation coming out of Spayne" settled in Ireland, and cites the "Irish Chronicles" as authority. Eudoxus expresses surprise:

> "*Eudox.* You doe very boldly, Irenaeus, adventure upon the historye of soe auncient times, and leane to confidently unto those Irish Chronicles which are most fabulous and forged, in that out of them you dare take in hand to lay open the originall of such a nation soe antique, as that noe monument remayneth of her beginning and first inhabiting there; specially having bene in those times allwayes without letters, but onely bare traditions of times and remembraunces of BARDES, which use to forge and falsifye every thing as they list, to please or displease any man."[27]
>
> Irenaeus replies: "Truly I must confesse I doe soe, but yet not soe absolutely as you suppose. I doe herin relye upon those Bards or Irish Chroniclers, though the Irish themselves, through theyr ignoraunce in matters of learning and deepe judgement, doe most constantly beleve and avouch them, but unto them besides I add my owne reading: . . ."[28]

After explaining his method of arriving at conclusions in these matters, and giving a list of authorities on (presumably) ancient migrations, Irenaeus reasserts his belief in the value of the Irish chronicles if used cautiously:

> "though . . . they have clouded the trueth of those times; yet there appeareth amongst them some reliques of the true antiquitye, though disguised, which a well-eyed man may happely discover and find out."[29]

Eudoxus objects that since the earliest inhabitants of Ireland had no knowledge of letters, the bards (i. e. chron-

---

[27]Globe ed., p. 625.

[28]*Ibid.*, p. 625.

[29]Globe ed., p. 626.

iclers), coming long afterwards, and dependent entirely upon tradition, were unable to "deliver certayntye of any thing."[30]

Irenaeus admits the untrustworthiness of the bards, but proceeds to explain his attitude toward the chronicles:

> "but yet for the antiquitye of the written Chronicles of Ireland give me leave to say something, not to justifye them, but to shewe that some of them might say trueth."[31]

He then explains to Eudoxus that the Irish had "letters" long before the English, and points out the source whence the letters were derived. His conclusion is that the Irish chronicles "doe err in the circumstances, not in the matter."[32]

Finally, Spenser exhibits in the *Veue* detailed knowledge of certain facts in Irish history that he could not have obtained from the standard and conventional sources. One example will suffice to illustrate. In explaining why the Irish "doe stand soe stifly against all rule and government," Irenaeus points out that during the struggle in England between the houses of Lancaster and York, when the English lords resident in Ireland were called over to England, the Irish took possession again of the lands whence they had been driven, and were thus able to resist complete English domination. He proceeds:

> "This was one of the occasions by which all those countryes which, lying neere unto any mountaynes or Irish desertes, had bene planted with English, were shortly displanted and lost. As namely in Mounster all the landes adjoyning to Slewloghir,[33] Arlo,[34] and the bogg of Allone.[35] In Connaught all the countryes

---

[30]*Ibid.*, p. 626.

[31]*Ibid.*, p. 626.

[32]*Ibid.*, p. 627.

[33]*I. e.*, Slewlougher, a moorland region in County Kerry.

[34]The vale of Aharlow, near Spenser's home in County Cork. He celebrates "Arlo hill" in hte "Mutabilitie" cantos: see canto VI, stanzas 36, 37, 54; canto VII, stanzas 3 and 4.

[35]The "Bog of Allan," which is, according to Kitchin (*Faerie Queene*, Book II, note on p. 217), "The general name for a set of turbaries [places where peat is cut] spread over a wide surface across the centre of the country, from Wicklow Head to Galway, and from Howth Head to Sligo."

bordering upon the Culvers,[36] Mointerolis,[37] and Oroirke[38] countrey. In Leinster all the landes neighbouring unto the mountaynes of Glaunmaleerih,[39] unto Shillelah,[40] unto the Briskelah,[41] and Polmonte.[42] In Ulster, all the countreys neere unto Tyrconnel,[43] Tyrone[44] and the Scotts."[45]

In none of Spenser's acknowledged sources could he have obtained all these data. Some of the places mentioned were quite obscure—as for instance "Polmonte" and "the Briskelah"—and were not to be found in printed works. The inference is then that Spenser's sources were Irish writings, or Irish traditions, or traditions among the English resident in Ireland. Possibly he drew upon all three.

There is additional evidence to strengthen this inference. Spenser himself (*i.e.*, Irenaeus) informs us that he had become acquainted with Irish poetry through translations.

"*Iren.* Yea truly; I have caused diverse of them [poems] to be translated unto me that I might understand them; and surely they savored of sweete witt and good invention, but skilled not of the goodly ornaments of Poetrye: yet were they sprinckled with some prety flowers of theyr owne naturall devise, which gave

---

[36]The "Curlews" or "Curlues," a mountainous region in County Sligo, often referred to in the Irish State Papers. See *St. P. Irel.*, 1586-88, pp. 176, 177, 349.

[37]A region in County Leitrim, too small and unimportant to be recorded on maps.

[38]The country dominated by the powerful clan of O'Rourkes, mainly in County Leitrim. See *St. P. Irel.*, 1592-96, pp. 36, 105, 161, 180.

[39]Glenmalure, a region in the mountains of County Wicklow, where Spenser's employer, Lord Grey, suffered disastrous defeat by the Irish. Spenser was probably present.

[40]The town of Shillelagh, in County Carlow.

[41]An obscure region in County Tipperary. See *St. P. Irel.*, 1596-97, p. 192.

[42]This may be the "Polmonton" recorded on one of the maps of the period (Boazio's). It is (or was) in the southwest corner of County Carlow.

[43]Or Tirconnel: the region now embraced (roughly) in County Donegal.

[44]County Tyrone, in Ulster.

[45]The Scots had settlements in County Antrim, Ulster. Their chief clan was that of the MacDonnells. See Hill, ***The MacDonnells of Antrim***, Belfast, 1873. For this passage, see Globe ed., p. 615.

> good grace and comliness unto them, the which it is greate pittye to see soe abused, . . ."[46]

It was easily possible, then, for Spenser to have obtained historical facts from Irish writings. Furthermore, this was quite commonly done in Spenser's time. English officials in Ireland often had recourse to these works to prove the antiquity of English claims and to justify various expedients of English policy. In Sir Henry Sidney's relation of his services in Ireland he cites the "Irish Chronicles" as authority for historical fact: the strong castle of Roscommon, he says, had been in possession of disloyal Irishmen for a hundred and sixty years, "for so long was it before that it was betrayed, and the English constable and ward murdered, as I found in the Irish Chronicles."[47]

In questions concerning claims to peerages and landholdings, Irish writings were often consulted. An instance is found in a document calendared in the Irish State Papers for the year 1592, entitled "Proof of Matters of Fact Contained in the Declaration of the Title of the Earl of Kildare to Sligo." The second "matter" adduced reads as follows: "2. The building of the castle and monastery of Sligo, by the Earl's ancestors, is proved by hearsay of many witnesses, and by reading of 'an English Antiquari,' who finds it as he saith, recorded in the Irish Chronicles of Ireland, and by another who saith that the same is found within the 'Book of Antiphonalles,' of the Abbey of Sligo."[48]

Use of Irish writings by the English is hinted at in a document of the year 1601, in which etymology is adduced as a means of enforcing claims to land. Under the "Probable reasons why Thomond ought to be under the government of Munster," the first "reason" is: " . . . by the originall name of Munster, Thomond was comprised as a part thereof, as the Irish word 'Twoghmene,' viz., North Munster, purported."[49]

---

[46]Globe ed., p. 641.
[47]*Carew Papers*, 1575-88, pp. 344 ff.
[48]*State Papers, Ireland*, 1588-92, p. 460.
[49]*Carew Papers*, 1601-03, p. 171.

This employment of Irish writings by the English authorities was not merely sporadic: some lords deputy were diligent collectors of Irish "antiquities," as for example, Sir Henry Sidney.[50] Sir George Carew, prominent in administrative circles in Spenser's times, was keenly interested in Irish history, and supplied the historian Camden with much material about Ireland. He seems to have investigated Irish sources.[51] It least one English official, in Spenser's time, was commissioned to undertake antiquarian research in Ireland. This was Meredith Hanmer, at one time vicar choral of Christ Church in Dublin, later chaplain in the army of the Earl of Ormond, and before his death recommended for the bishopric of Down.[52] In 1594 he wrote to Lord Burghley concerning his work as an antiquarian,—"I beinge sett a worke to collect the antiquities of this land."[53] How far this included study of the Irish chronicles is not clear; but that he had some acquaintance with the Irish language is suggested by the presence in the Irish State Papers of documents attributed (tentatively) by the editor to Hanmer. One of these is called "Fragments of a catechism on the ten commandments, in Irish."[54] The fruits of Hanmer's research were published in 1633 in a "history" of Ireland.[55]

In view of these facts, then, it is a logical assumption that Spenser, with his keen interest in Irish matters, would not have neglected, as a source for historical data, Irish traditions and Irish writings. His specific indebtedness is, to be sure, not easy to determine. The purpose of the present discussion is merely to point the way toward a solution of the problem.

---

[50]See *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, "Sir Henry Sidney."
[51]See *ibid.*, "Sir George Carew", Gibson's ed. of Camden, II, p. 338.
[52]*State Papers, Ireland*, 1596-7, p. 427; *ibid.*, 1600-1, pp. 110, 241.
[53]*Ibid.*, 1592-96, p. 229.
[54]*Ibid.*, 1600-1, pp. 119-120.
[55]By Sir James Ware. See *supra*, p. 9, Note 9.

II

Although Spenser was willing to admit that the Irish chronicles possessed a broad basis of fact in their narratives, he shared the prevailing contempt for the legends of the early invasions. His brief discussion of these in the *Veue* seems to be based on Holinshed, Camden, and Buchanan, whose sources were, of course, ultimately the chronicles. Since he regarded the legends as fabulous, he was not interested to investigate the sources, but turned to the most convenient authorities.

Spenser introduces these legends into his discussion of the origins of Irish customs. He cites the stories of the invasions as examples of the untrustworthiness of the chronicles in details concerning the problems of racial descent.

> "For all that came out of Spayne (they being noe diligent searchers into the differences of nations) supposed them to be Spanyards, and soe called them; but the groundwork thereof is nevertheless as I sayd true and certayne, however they through ignoraunce disguise the same, or through theyr owne vanitie (while they would not seeme to be ignoraunt), doe therupon build and enlarge many forged historyes of theyr owne antiquitye, which they deliver to fooles, and make them believe them for trewe: as for example, that first of one Gathelus the sonn of Cecrops or Argos, who having marryed the king of Aegipts daughter, thence sayled with her into Spayne, and there inhabited: Then that of Nemed and his fowre sonnes, who coming out of Scythia peopled Ireland, and inhabited it with his sonnes two hundred and fiftye yeares untill he was overcome of the Gyauntes dwelling then in Ireland, and at last quite banished and rooted out, after whom two hundred yeares, the sonnes of one Dela, being Scythyans, arrived there agayne, and possessed the whole land, of which the youngest, called Slevius,[56] in the end made himself monarch. Lastly, of the foure sonnes of Mylesius King of Spayne, which conquered that land from the Scythyans, and inhabited it with Spanyardes, and called it of the youngest, Hiberus, Hybernia; all which are in very trueth fables, and very Mylesian lyes (as the Latine proverbe is), for never was there such a King of Spayne called Mylesius, nor anie such colonie

---

[56]Ware (correctly) has "Slanius"; see *Anc. Ir. Hist.*, I, Spenser, p. 68.

seated with his sonnes, as they fayne, that can be prooved; but yet under these tales ye may in a manner see the trueth lurke . . ."[57]

Further on, Irenaeus refers to these legends in the passage concerning Scota, the daughter of Pharaoh.[58]

For his account of Gathelus, Spenser seems to have drawn upon both Holinshed (more exactly, Stanihurst in Holinshed) and Buchanan. The former has the following about Gathelus:

"In the years of the world 2436 . . . Gathelus, the son of one Neale, a great Lord in Grecia was . . . exiled . . . This noble gentleman . . . coming into Egypt, got honorable entertainment of Pharao . . . Afterwards departing . . . landing first in Portingall . . . Finallie, Gathelus with a certeine number of them passed over into Ireland . . ."[59]

Buchanan seems to have been the authority for the statement that Gathelus was the "sonne of Cecrops or Argus."

"The Scots make a chief named Gathelus the founder of their nation, but whether they chose a son of Argos or Cecrops, they have left uncerteine . . . having marched into Egypt, he is said to have performed many illustrious actions . . . Then with his wife Scota, the daughter of the King of Egypt, having circumnavigated all the coast of Europe, bordering on the Mediterranean Sea . . . some authors set him down at the mouth of the river Iberus . . ."[60]

Nemedus and his four sons are mentioned briefly in Holinshed:

"Nemodus with his foure sonnes, Starius, Garbaneles, Anunius, Fergusius, captains over a faire companie of people . . ."[61]

Spenser's statement that Nemedus and his sons inhabited Ireland two hundred and fifty years, however, could not have had its source in Holinshed. Possibly careless reading of one of the appendices to Stanihurst's *De Rebus*

---

[57]Globe ed., p. 627.

[58]*Ibid.*, p. 632.

[59]Holinshed's *Chronicles*, ed. 1808, VI, pp. 76, 77. See also V *(History of Scotland)* for a full account of Gathelus (pp. 34-35)).

[60]Buchanan, *History of Scotland*, tr. Aikman, I, chap. xi, p. 76.

[61]Holinshed, *Chronicles*, ed. 1808, VI, p. 75.

was responsible. On page 239 of this work is printed chapter 3 of the third "Distinction" of Giraldus Cambrensis's *Topographia Hiberniae,* in which an account is given of Nemedus.

> "Ducentis igitur et quindecim annis Nemedi generatio Hiberniam tenuit, et ducentis postmodum annis vacua fuit."[62]

It may be that Spenser misread *quindecim* for *quinquaginta.*

In the same chapter of Holinshed is given an account of Dela:

> ". . . which thing comming to the knowledge of the Grecians mooved five brethren, sonnes to one Dela, being notable seamen and skilful pilots to rig a navie, and to attempt the conquest of the Island [Ireland]. These were of the posteritie of Nemodus, and named Gandius, Genandius, Sagundus, Rutheranius, and Slanius . . . finallie arriving here in Ireland . . . wan the whole countrie . . ."[63]

Where Spenser got his information about Milesius is not clear: Holinshed does not mention him, nor does Camden, who makes Hiberus and his brother Herimon Spaniards. Giraldus Cambrensis, however, devotes a chapter of his *Topographia* to the two sons of Milesius, Heberus and Herimon.[64] Possibly this was Spenser's source, although there is nothing in the passage to suggest it.

---

[62]The text printed in the Rolls Series has "sedecim" instead of "quindecim." The chapter heading in this edition reads: *De tertio adventu; Nemedi scilicet, a partibus Scithiae, cum quatuor filiis suis.*

[63]Holinshed, *Chronicles,* ed. 1808, VI, p. 75.

[64]Distinctio III, cap. VI: *De quinto adventu; quatuor scilicet filiorum Milesii,* etc.

According to the conventional version of this early colonization, or series of colonizations, as given in one of the standard authorities on Irish history (Joyce, *Short History of Ireland,* chap. iv) the order of invasions was as follows: First, the Parthalonians, in the year of the world (A. M.) 2520. Next, the Nemedeans, A. M. 2850. Nemed was from Scythia. Then came the Formorians, sea-robbers, who tyrannized over the Nemedeans. The third colony was of the Firbolgs, A. M. 3266, who came into Ireland under the leadership of the five sons of Dela. These divided Ireland into Ulster, Leinster, Connaught, and the two Munsters. The fourth colony was of the Dedannans, A. M. 3303. The fifth colony, A. M. 3500, the Milesians, who came into Ireland under the leadership of the eight sons of Miled or Milesius.

It is clear, then, that while Holinshed was Spenser's main source for his knowledge of the legendary colonization of Ireland, he was not his sole source. Even in so brief a passage as that quoted from the *Veue*, we find evidence of Spenser's consulting several works to find out the "probabilitye of things." Besides this there are signs of Spenser's characteristic uncritical use of his material, of hasty reading, and perhaps of defective memory.

III

Spenser's skepticism concerning these stories of the early invasions stands in striking contrast with his acceptance of legendary or semi-legendary British history which concerns Ireland. Mention has already been made of his treatment in the *Faerie Queene* of the legend of Gurgunt's authority over Ireland as if it were history.[65] In the *Veue* the same attitude is maintained.

> "Finally it appeareth by good record yet extant, that King Arthur, and before him Gurgunt, had all that Iland in his allegeaunce and subjection . . ."[66]

Spenser's sources for this statement, as Miss Harper points out, were Geoffrey of Monmouth and Holinshed. In the same connection Spenser mentions King Egfred and King Edgar.

> "After all which the Saxons succeeding, subdued it wholly unto themselves. For first Egfrid, Kinge of Northumberlande, did utterly waste and subdue it, as it appeareth out of Bede his complaynt against him; and afterwardes King Edgar brought it under his obedience, as it appeareth by an auncient record,

---

[65]See *supra*, pp. 7-8 Miss Harper points out (without further discussion) the fact that Spenser employs this legend again, in the *Veue*. She notes also his reference there to King Egfrid and King Edgar, both of whom, according to Spenser, had dominion over Ireland. See Miss Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

[66]Globe ed., p. 629.

in which it is found written that he subdued all the Ilands of the North, even unto Norway, and them the king did bring into his subjection."[67]

For these statements about the two kings Spenser's authority could not have been Holinshed, for while the stories of both Egfrid and Edgar are related there at some length, nothing is said about their conquest of Ireland. We find in Camden, however, a passage which Spenser's account follows rather closely.

"Anno enim sexcentesimo quadragesimo quarto a Christo nato, Egfridus, Northanhumbrorum rex caedibus & incendiis Hiberniam Anglis amicissimam confudit, quo nomine a Beda gravissimis verbis subaccusatur. Inde Norwegi Turgesio duce regionem per triginta annos indiginissimis populationibus devastaverunt, sed illo demum ex insidiis sublato, in Norwegos caede adeo atroci grassati sunt incolae, ut vix nuncius tantae cladis superfuerit. Norwegi hi procul dubio Normanni illi fuerunt, qui, ut inquit Eginhardus, Caroli magni temporibus, *Hiberniam, Scotorum insulam aggressi, a Scotis in fugam conversierant.* Postea *Oustmanni,* id est, *Viri Orientales,* e maritima Germania in Hiberniam venerunt, qui cum magnae & copiosae mercatùrae specie quasdam urbes occupassent, difficillimum bellum concitarunt. Eodem fere tempore Eadgarus Rex Anglorum potentissimus magnam Hiberniae partem devicit."[68]

Spenser's interest in the early history of Ireland, then, was keen enough to induce him to consult more than one authority on the subject. In so far as the legends concerned England, and rested on the basis of English tradition, he accepted them, apparently with implicit faith.

IV

Coming now to Spenser's use of authentic Irish history —that is, authentic from his point of view—in his prose tract, and to his sources, we find that he employs Irish history in the *Veue* in three ways, or more exactly, in connection with three divisions of his discussion: as explanation of existing conditions in Ireland, as justification for English policies in Ireland, and as support for his own theories and

---

[67]*Ibid.*, p. 629.

[68]*Britannia,* ed. 1586, p. 495; ed. 1600, p. 761.

plans for the "reformation" of Ireland. In order to demonstrate Spenser's method, and to indicate his sources for his statements, it will be necessary to discuss at length only representative passages under each head.

The historical matters cited under the first head are: the "conquest" of Ireland under Henry II of England,[69] the uprising of the Irish during the Wars of the Roses,[70] the "calling away" to England of the Duke of Clarence,[71] the revolt under "Murroh-en-Ranah."[72] the invasion under Edward Bruce,[73] the rebellion of Thomas Fitzgerald,[74] the "conquests" by the two English kings, Edgar and Egfrid,[75] the rule of King Arthur over Ireland,[76] the coming to Ireland of Earl "Strongbow,"[77] the letter from the citizens of Cork,[78] the coming to Ireland of St. Patrick,[79] and the long struggles between the Butlers and the Geraldines.[80]

The conquest of Henry II Spenser mentions briefly, in his discussion of the unsettled state of law in Ireland.

> ". . . for by the conquest of Henry II, true it is the Irish were utterly vanquished and subdued, soe as noe enemye was able to hold up his head agaynst his power; in which theyre weakness he brought in his lawes, and settled them as now they there remayne, like as William the Conquerour did . . ."[81]

Spenser is here expressing the conventional—and inaccurate—opinion about the Anglo-Norman colonization of Ireland during the reign of Henry II. Since such an opinion was flattering to English self-esteem, it was not likely that the self-styled "conquering" race would seek to investigate

---

[69]Globe ed., p. 614.
[70]*Ibid.*, pp. 614-15.
[71]*Ibid.*, p. 615.
[72]*Ibid.*, p. 615.
[73]*Ibid.*, pp. 615-16.
[74]*Ibid.*, p. 617.
[75]*Ibid.*, p. 629.
[76]*Ibid.*, p. 629.
[77]*Ibid.*, pp. 614, and 619.
[78]*Ibid.*, p. 636.
[79]*Ibid.*, p. 645.
[80]*Ibid.*, p. 649.
[81]Globe ed., p. 614.

the sources of their belief. The authority for this period of Irish history was, for the English, Giraldus Cambrensis, whose *Expugnatio Hiberniae* gives a long and detailed account of the "conquest." Spenser, as we have already seen, must have been acquainted with the translation of this work in Holinshed.

The coming to Ireland of Earl "Strongbow" (Richard de Clare), an incident in the "conquest," finds a place also in Giraldus Cambrensis's work,[82] which was no doubt Spenser's source.

Holinshed again was probably Spenser's source for his account of the invasion of Ireland by Edward Bruce, brother of Robert Bruce, king of Scotland, in 1315.

Spenser's account is as follows:

> "This Edward le Bruce was brother to Robert le Bruce, who was king of Scotland at such time as King Edward the Second raigned here in England, and bare a most malicious and spiteful mynd against King Edward, doing him all the hurt he could, and annoying his territoryes of England, whilest he was troubled with civill warres of his Barrons at home. He also, to woorke him the more mischeif, sent over his sayd brother Edward with a power of Scottes and Redd-shankes into Ireland, where, by the meanes of the Lacyes and of the Irish with whom he combined, they gott footing, and gathering to him all the scatterlinges and outlawes out of the woodes and mountaynes, in which they long had lurked, marched foorth into the English Pale, which was then cheifly in the North, from the poynt of Dunluce and beyond unto Dublin . . . There the sayd Edward le Bruce spoyled and burnt all the olde English inhabitants, and sacked and razed all cittyes and corporat townes noe lesse then Murrogh-en-Ranagh, of whom I earst told you . . . And coming to Dundalke, he there made himself king, and raigned by the space of one whole yeare, by the name of Edward King of Ireland, till that King Edward of England, having set some quiett in his affayres at home, sent over the Lord John Bremmegham to be generall of the warres agaynst him, whoe, encountering him neare to Dundalke, overthrewe his armye and slew himself . . . "[83]

There are two accounts in Holinshed of this invasion of Ireland by Edward Bruce, a brief account in the "Historie

---

[82]*Expugnatio Hiberniae*, Dist. I, cap. xvi.

[83]Globe ed., p. 616.

of Scotland,"[84] and one much longer and more circumstantial in that part of the *Chronicles* devoted to Ireland.[85] Since the latter is fuller in detail, and is written from the English point of view—as the Scottish version is not—the inference is that it is Spenser's source. Buchanan's narrative is very brief;[86] Camden gives no account of this period of Irish history. Campion may have been consulted by Spenser, but there are no indications that he was.[87]

For his account of St. Patrick, Spenser probably turned to Holinshed. Spenser introduces the missionary saint into his discussion of the prevailing "faults" in religion in Ireland. The true Christian religion, he asserts, was already corrupted when St. Patrick came to Ireland, ". . . in the time of Pope Celestine, whoe, as it is written, did first send over thither Palladius, whoe there deceasinge, he afterwardes sent over St. Patricke, being by nation a Britton, who converted the people (being then Infidells) from paganisme and christened them."[88]

Both Palladius and Patrick are mentioned several times in Holinshed.

Spenser's statements may have been derived from the following:

> ". . . when Paladius was to depart, one Patrike attended at Rome, suing for leave to be sent into Ireland.
>
> The Pope therefore granted that Paladius might passe over to the Scots in Britaine, and appointed Patrike to go with authoritie from him into Ireland; . . ."[89]
>
> "This Patrike, in Latine called Patricius, was borne in the marches betwixt England and Scotland, in a town by the sea called Eiburne, whose father hight Calphurnius . . ."[90]

---

[84]Ed. 1808, V, p. 351.

[85]*Ibid.*, VI, pp. 246-51.

[86]*History of Scotland*, tr. Aikman, I, pp. 429-30.

[87]*Ancient Irish Histories*, ed. Ware, 1809, I, Campion, pp. 120-24.

[88]Globe ed., p. 645.

[89]Holinshed, *Chronicles*, ed. 1808, VI, p. 83.

[90]*Ibid.* See also Holinshed, I, pp. 48, 562; V, p. 134; VI, pp. 36, 74-75, 84, 85, 86, 212.

Spenser's account, however, does not quite correspond to that in Holinshed, and it is possible that he consulted other works also.

For the rebellion of Thomas Fitzgerald, in the year 1535, and the rule of King Arthur over Ireland, Holinshed likewise seems to have been Spenser's source. The rebellion Spenser mentions in passing, with the assertion that it spread over the greater part of Ireland.[91] Holinshed gives a long and detailed account of this uprising; this Spenser probably read.[92] King Arthur, as we have seen, is mentioned with Gurgunt as having had dominion over Ireland.[93] According to Holinshed, King Arthur received homage for Ireland.[94]

The "conquests" of the two English Kings, Arthur and Egfrid, were related, as has been shown, in Camden,[95] but not in Holinshed.

That Spenser read of the letter from the citizens of Cork in Holinshed is probable; but his use of the word "Shrewsbury" instead of "Salisbury" suggests that he had read Campion's account also.[96]

For the other historical references under this head, Spenser's sources are not certainly Holinshed. There are no passages in this authority which we can positively identify as furnishing the material for Spenser's discussion of the rise to power of the Irish during the Wars of the Roses, of the recall to England of the Duke of Clarence (Lionel, son of Edward III), or of the long and destructive warfare between the Butlers and the Geraldines. Spenser's knowledge of the first topic was, as has been shown, more detailed than would have been possible if he had depended entirely on printed authorities. The third topic, to which contemporary conditions in Ireland gave decided point and interest, must have become almost a commonplace in Ire-

---

[91]Globe ed., p. 617.

[92]See ed. 1808, VI, pp. 288-303.

[93]See p. 24, *supra.*

[94]Holinshed, *Chronicles*, ed. 1808, pp. 67, 77, 187.

[95]See pp. 24-25, *supra.*

[96]See pp. 11-12, *supra.*

land in Spenser's lifetime; and tradition, rather than books, may have been his source.

The revolt of "Murroh-en-Ranah" is not mentioned in any of Spenser's usual authorities; and it is probable that here he drew upon Irish sources. According to Spenser, after the Duke of Clarence, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, had been "called away" from Ireland, and had died, all the north of Ireland revolted and made O'Neill their leader, and "there arose in that part of Tomond, one of the O'Briens, called Murroh-en-Ranah, that is Morrice of the Fearne, or wast wilde places, whoe gathering unto him all the relicks of the disconted Irish, eftsones surprised the said castle of Clare, burnt all, and spoyled all the English dwelling there, ..." Increasing in power, he "over-ran all Mounster and Connaght," overcame Leinster, and finally "was called King of all Ireland; . . ."[97]

It is not quite clear to what person or what rebellion Spenser is here referring. No leader under this name seems to be mentioned in Irish history. It is possible that Spenser confused certain events and names, depending for his facts upon his memory of what he had once read or heard related. The man whose career comes nearest to conforming to Spenser's narrative is Art MacMurrough "Comhanach," the leading member of the trio of Irish chieftains who led the struggle of the natives against the English rule in the latter part of the fourteenth century. As to the general nature of the conquests made under the leadership of this chief Spenser is correct. But he is in error in making MacMurrough—if he is here referring to this leader—a Prince of Thomond; he was, as a matter of fact, King of Leinster; nor was he an O'Brien, as Spenser states.[98]

Coming to our second division, we find that as justification for the English policy of treating Ireland as a subjugated nation, Spenser cites the parliament summoned in

---

[97]Globe ed., p. 615.

[98]See *A Short History of the Irish People*, by Hayden and Moonan, pp. 168-70.

Ireland under the vice-royalty of Sir Anthony St. Leger,[99] discusses the question of the ancient right of the crown of England to the sovereignty over Ireland,[100] and points out the falsity of the claim of the O'Neills to the overlordship of Ulster.[101] All three topics were related to the chief question at issue between the English government and the Irish people: By what right did England possess and rule over Ireland? Spenser vigorously upholds the accepted English doctrine, that Ireland belonged to England by right of conquest,—that is, the "conquest" under Henry II. He develops this doctrine in the early part of the *Veue,* in a discussion by Irenaeus and Eudoxus on the faults in the laws of Ireland. The question is brought up as to whether the whole realm of Ireland did or did not "universally accept and acknowledge" the suzerainty of King Henry VIII. Irenaeus asserts that such an acknowledgement had been made.

> ". . . in a Parliament houlden in the time of Sir Anthony Sent-Leger, then Lord Deputye, all the Irish lordes and principall men came in, and being by sure means wrought therunto, acknowledged King Henry for theyr soverayne lord, reserving yet (as some say) unto themselves all theyr owne former priviledges and signioryes inviolate."[102]

Holinshed notices this parliament very briefly: " . . . to this parlement resorted diverse of the Irish lords, who submitting themselves to the deputie his mercie, returned peaceablie to their countries."[103]

Campion's account is longer and more circumstantial:

> "Sir Anthony Sentleger, Knight of the Garter, Lord Deputy. He summoned a Parliament, wherein the Geraldines were attainted, Abbeyes suppressed, the king named supreme head and king of Ireland, because he recognized no longer to hold it of the Pope. At this Parliament appeared Irish Lords Mac Gilpatricke, Lord Barry, Mac Cartimore, O-brene, and diverse more,

---

[99]Globe ed., p. 611.
[100]*Ibid.*, p. 612.
[101]*Ibid.*, p. 659.
[102]*Ibid.*, p. 611.
[103]Holinshed, *Chronicles*, ed. 1808, vol. VI, pp. 313-14.

whom followed Con Oneale, submitting himselfe to the King's Deputy, and after to the King himselfe . . ."[104]

The latter authority, then, may have been Spenser's source. Proceeding from this point, Irenaeus goes on to show that Henry VIII, in receiving the name of King of Ireland, received nothing that was not possessed by his ancestors.

". . . for by this Act of Parliament whereof we speake, nothing was given to King Henry which he had not before from his auncestours, but onely the bare name of a King: for all other absolute power of principalitye he had in himself before derived from many former Kinges, his famous progenitors and woorthy conquerours of that land. The which, sithence they first conquered and subdued unto them by force, what needeth afterward to enter into any such idle termes with them to be called theyr King, wheras it was in the power of the conquerour to take upon himself what he will over the dominions conquered."[105]

For this expression of opinion, probably Spenser was indebted to no individual passage in any one of his authorities. He was here uttering what was a commonplace to Englishmen who had studied the Irish question.

Since Ireland belonged to the crown by right of conquest, all lordships were held by title from the crown. The O'Neills then had no claim to sovereignty over Ulster other than that granted by the king of England. In the latter part of the *Veue,* Irenaeus insists upon this fact.

"For the right of O-Neals in the signiorye of the Northe, it is surely none at all: For beside that the Kinges of England conquered all the realme, and thereby assumed and invested all the right of that land to themselves and theyr heyres and successours forever, soe as nothing was left in O-neale but what he receaved back from them, O-Neale himselfe never had any auncient signiorye in that countreye, but what by usurpation and encrochement, after the death of the Duke of Clarence, he gott upon the English, whose lands and possessions being formerly wasted by the Scotts, under the leading of Edward le Bruce, (as I formerly declared unto you) he eft-sones entred into, and sithence hath wrongfullye detayned, through the other

---

[104]*Ancient Irish Histories,* ed. Ware, 1809, I, Campion, p. 181.
[105]Globe ed., p. 612.

occupations and great affayres which the kinges of England (soone after) fell into heere at home, soe as they could not intend to the recoverye of that countrey of the Northe, nor the restrayning of the insolencye of O-Neale; whoe, finding none now to withstand him, reigned in that desolation, and made himselfe Lord of those fewe people that remayned there, uppon whom ever since he hath continued his first usurped power, and nowe exacteth and extorteth upon all men what he list . . ."[106]

Spenser's source for this passage is uncertain: Holinshed seems to have nothing similar. Camden, however, in his description of the province of Ulster, gives a brief account of its fortunes in historic times, to which Spenser's explanation bears some resemblance.

"Quo tempore cum Angelia in partes discederet, intestino exardescente bello, & Angli qui hic meruerunt, Ultonia relicta, domum profecti partes sequerentur, O-Neale, & alii Hibernicae originis in has regiones involarunt, & ita barbarie efferarunt, ut nihil supra. Iam inde cum non solum qui ex O-Neali sunt familia, sed etiam qui viribus & gratia plurimum valent, O-Neali titulum tanquam honorarium usurpant, Ultoniae Dominos se gerunt, & miserum populum pensitandis tributis exhauriunt: . . ."[107]

Additional evidence of Spenser's use of Camden is found in a passage in the *Veue,* which, while not strictly, perhaps, belonging under this head, is nevertheless related to the subject matter, and which also furnishes an excellent illustration of Spenser's method of treating his sources. After discoursing upon the impossibility of an English governor's pleasing either the English or the Irish, Irenaeus concludes: "And this is the wretchedness of that fatall kingdome which, I thinke, therefore, was in old times not called amisse Banna or sacra Insula, taking sacred (sacra) for accursed."[108] The notion that Ireland was a country under a curse was common in Spenser's time; and he was here repeating current opinion. But his use of the word "Banna" is odd, as well as his assumption that the adjective "sacra" as anciently applied to Ireland meant "accursed." The ex-

---

[106]Globe ed., p. 659.

[107]*Britannia,* ed. 1594, p. 671; ed. 1600, p. 785.

[108]Globe ed., p. 649. Ware's text omits this sentence. See *Anc. Irish Histories,* 1809, vol. I, Spenser, p. 148.

planation is apparently found in the *Britannia.* In his discussion of the various ancient names of Ireland, Camden says:

> "Praeter haec Hiberniae nomina quae dixi, Hibernici bardi in suis cantilenis hanc insulam etiam Banno appellitant, unde vero me latet, ni Bannomanna illa sit, quam ex Timaeo memorat Plinius, dum extrema Europae, & littus Oceani Septentrionalis in laeva a Scythia ad Gades usque legit. Quae enim illa Bannomanna fuerit, Geographia nondum constat."[109]

In the margin at this point are the words, "Sacra Insula." Holinshed mentions this name, "Banna," but without attaching any such significance to it as does Spenser.

Spenser here, apparently, recollected that the name "Banno" was anciently applied to Ireland, and assuming that it was related to the verb "ban," "to curse," he used it to enforce his point, that the country was under a curse. Recollecting also that Ireland had been called "Sacra insula," he assumed that "sacra" in this connection had its alternative meaning, and so made the two words equivalent to "Banna." This treatment of his sources is quite characteristic of Spenser.

Spenser's use of Irish history to illustrate his theories and justify his plans of "reformation" embrace the following historical facts and conditions: the taking of the "corporate oath" of fealty by Irish lords and gentlemen in the reigns of Edward II and Henry VII,[110] the commission under Sir William Drury to inquire into land tenures,[111] and the statute in the reign of Edward IV by which every Irishman was required to take a surname.[112] In addition to these, he cites two illustrative facts from English history

---

[109]*Britannia,* ed. 1594, p. 643; ed. 1600, p. 756. According to Joyce, (*Short History of Ireland,* chap. IV) Banba was the name of the wife of Mac Grena, one of the legendary heroes of Ireland. Two other women in Irish history, according to the same authority, gave their names to the island: Eirè and Fodla.

[110]Globe ed., pp. 672-73.

[111]*Ibid.,* p. 674.

[112]*Ibid.,* p. 677.

—the creation of new barons by Edward III and the subdivision by King Alfred of his kingdom into small administrative units.

The "corporate oath" Spenser cites in connection with his plan for securing the loyalty of the Irish nobility.

> ". . . I hold it meete that there were onely suretyes taken of them, and one bound for another, whereby, yf any shall swarve, his suretyes shall for safegarde of theyr bandes either bring him in, or seeke to serve upon him: and besides this, I would wish them all to be sworne to her Majestie . . . Soe I reade, that in the raigne of Edwarde the Second, and also of Henry the Seaventh, (when the times were verye broken) that there was a corporat oath taken of all the lordes and best gentell-men of fealtye to the king, . . ."[113]

For these statements about Edward II, Spenser was probably indebted to two passages in Holinshed, the first in the Irish section of the Chronicles, the second in the history of England.

> "In time of these troubles and warres in Ireland by the invasion thus of the Scots, certeine Irish lords, faithfull men and true subjects to the king of England, did not onelie promise to continue in their loiall obeisance towards him, being their sovereign prince; but also for more assurance delivered hostages to be kept within the castell of Dublin. The names of which lords that were so contented to assure their allegiance were these, Iohn Fitzthomas lord of Offalie, Richard le Clare, Morice Fitzthomas, Thomas Fitzjohn le Power baron of Donoille, Arnold le Power, Morice Rochford, David de la Roch, and Miles de la Roch."[114]
>
> "But when the English still prevailed, diverse of the greatest princes among them [the Irish] came in, and submitted themselves. Amongst other, four kings are mentioned."[115]

For the "corporate oath" in the reign of Henry VII, Spenser's source must have been some other authority than

---

[113]*Ibid.*, pp. 672-73.

[114]Holinshed, *Chronicles*, ed. 1808, VI, p. 247. Sir James Ware, in a footnote in his edition of the *Veue* (see *Anc. Irish Hist.*, 1809, I, Spenser, p. 230) asserts that Richard II, not Edward II, was sovereign when the oath was taken. But Spenser seems to have had Holinshed's authority.

[115]*Ibid.*, II, p. 824.

Holinshed. He seems to be correct as to the fact, however. Sir James Ware substantiates Spenser's statement in a footnote, in his edition of the *Veue,* and adds some details.[116]

The commission for inquiring into land tenures, which, according to Spenser, was sent out "in the time of Sir William Drurye," is cited in the *Veue* in connection with the author's scheme for "reforming" the abuses in the system of land-holding in Ireland.

> "For reformation of all which, it were good that a commission should be graunted foorth under the Great Seale, as I have seene once recorded in the old counsell booke of Mounster; It was sent foorthe in the time of Sir William Drurye unto persons of speciall trust and judgment to enquire throughout all Ireland . . . how everye man holdeth his lands, . . ."[117]

Official records, then, rather than histories, may well have been Spenser's source here. His position of Clerk of the Council in Munster naturally gave him access to such documents. The Irish State Papers do not mention this commission; but such an omission does not, of course, mean that Spenser was in error.

Spenser's plan for the "reformation" of Ireland includes a number of schemes for compelling the Irish people to live according to English standards. One of his recommendations toward this end is to revive "that old statute in Ireland that was made in the realme of England (in the raigne of Edward the Fourth), by which it was commanded that . . . from thencefoorth ech one should take unto himselfe a severall surname, either of his trade or facultye, or of some qualitye of his body or mynd, or of the place where he dwelt, . . ."[118] There is no mention of this statute in either Holinshed or Camden;[119] and probably Spenser here again got his information from official docu-

---

[116]*Anc. Irish Hist.,* 1809, I, Spenser, p. 230.

[117]Globe ed., p. 674.

[118]Globe ed., p. 677.

[119]I have been unable to consult the Irish Statutes, either to confirm or to disprove Spenser's statement.

ments. According to Sir James Ware, the act was passed in the fifth year of King Edward's reign.[120]

What Spenser's authority was for his statement that King Edward III, in order to offset the power of the clergy, created new barons, is not clear.[121] The histories make no mention of such a procedure in the reign of that monarch.

Spenser's discussion of King Alfred's method of securing peace in his kingdom by dividing the country into tithings, hundreds, and wapentakes, was certainly based on Holinshed, and probably also on Camden.[122] The resemblances between the *Veue* and Holinshed are very close. Demonstration of Spenser's indebtedness, however, would require too much space.

From the foregoing evidence it would seem safe to conclude that Spenser's knowledge of Irish history was fairly wide, although not profound or exact. Its range embraced ancient, medieval, and contemporary Ireland. While in matters of detail, Spenser was often inexact and careless, he displays occasionally indications that he possessed a knowledge of minutiae not to be gained from general reading. His chief reliance for the whole field of Irish history was inevitably Holinshed's *Chronicles*, the one outstanding historical authority for the British isles. But he read —if not always carefully—nearly all the available books on Ireland. Occasionally he adduced facts from more than one authority into a single passage. Besides printed works in English and Latin, he probably made some use of Irish writings, and drew upon Irish legends and traditions. To-

---

[120]See *Anc. Ir. Hist.*, I, Spenser, p. 244. Spenser's application of the statute to all Irishmen Sir James Ware declares to be an error: "The statute," he says, "referres onely to the Irish dwelling among the English in the counties of Dublin, Moth, Uriel, and Kildare."

[121]Globe ed., p. 671. Spenser cites this alleged fact in justification of his plan for the English in Ireland to obtain complete control of the Irish parliament.

[122]*Ibid.*, p. 671. See Holinshed, *Chronicles*, "Description of England," by Harrison, ed. 1808, I, pp. 257 ff, and pp. 674 ff. See also reprint of Harrison by the New Shakespeare Soc., ed. Furnivall, pp. 91 ff. See Camden, *Britannia*, ed. 1586, pp. 8-9.

ward these he was critical, and attempted to discriminate between fabulous narrative, and fact buried in legend. But even legendary material in English histories and chronicles he seems to have accepted as sober fact. Furthermore, he regarded all his historical data from an English point of view. Finally, while at times his adherence to his sources, particularly to Holinshed, is rather close, he seems generally to have depended upon his memory—which was not infallible—for his facts.

These conclusions are not particularly novel, it is true, and offer small basis for new theories about Spenser's life or writings. But they may throw light on his reaction to his Irish environment, and point the way to a solution of some of the problems concerning his life in Ireland.

TRIPARTITE GAUL IN THE STORY OF KING LEIR

By Robert Adger Law

The kingdom of Gallia, or France, plays an important part in the story of King Leir, or, to use Shakespeare's spelling, King Lear. In the many versions anterior to Shakespeare it is Gallia who marries Cordeilla, youngest daughter of King Leir, after her father has cast her off without dowry on her refusal to declare her filial affection. Later, when Leir's two elder daughters prove their insincerity and ingratitude, Cordeilla welcomes her father in her adopted land, and lends him armed assistance in regaining his throne. So far practically all versions agree. But difficulty arises when one tries to determine the definite realm over which the Gallian king, or prince, rules. This difficulty has been squarely faced but not removed by three well known contemporary scholars: Dr. Wilfrid Perrett, Dr. Carrie A. Harper, and Sir Sidney Lee.

Perrett, who in his *Story of King Lear from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Shakespeare* (1904) has carefully examined every obtainable version of the tale, states in connection with Spenser's *Faerie Queene:*

> In Spenser we have to do with an antiquary who has followed the then burning question of the authenticity of the British record with a zeal which it would not repay me for the purposes of this study to emulate. I therefore leave unanswered such questions as why he wrote "Aganip of Celtica" when "Gallia" would have given a better rhyme.[1]

Dr. Harper, investigating *The Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser's Faerie Queene* (1910), quotes this very sentence from Perrett in her introduction,[2] but does not attempt to answer the question raised.

Sir Sidney Lee, in his edition of the anonymous pre-Shakespearian play of *King Leir* (London, 1909), attacks the same general problem from a different angle, but finds

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 91.
[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

no answer satisfactory to himself. Says he, in discussing a single phrase from the play, "Genouestan Gawles":

> The phrase is difficult to explain. Warner in his *Albion's England*, Bk. III, ch. xvi, in describing the exploits in France of Bren or Brennus, a successor of Lear on the British throne, mentioned that Bren's allies in Gaul were "the *Cenouesean Gawles.*" Doubtless the old dramatist there found the word, which his printer reproduced as *Genouestan.* Neither form is quite comprehensible. The dominion of the Gallian King in the play clearly extended to the Northern coast of France, where Cuisne (near Calais) seems the only place of possible philological kinship with Genouestan. Orleans, the city of mid France, seems to have been originally called Cenabum or Genabum, and its inhabitants Cenabenses or Genabenses. But the French prince who was Lear's son-in-law has no obvious relation with a region so far to the south.[3]

In view of so much uncertainty, it seems worthwhile to examine the whole case again in the light of additional evidence.

I

Geoffrey's *"tertiam partem Galliae"*

Any account of King Leir may well begin with Geoffrey of Monmouth, who in his *Historia Regum Britanniae* (circa 1138) first put the story into something like its form as we know it. According to Geoffrey, the Gallian King's title is "Aganippus rex Francorum," though his land is consistently called Gallia. Hearing the fame of Cordeilla's beauty, he sends to King Leir to ask her hand in marriage. Leir is willing to bestow her, but still angry with her as a result of the love test, refuses to give dowry of money or territories. The story proceeds:

> Cumque id Aganippo nunciatum fuisset, amore virginis inflammatus, misit iterum ad Leirum regem, dicens se satis auri & argenti, aliarumque possessionum habere quia tertiam partem Galliae possidebat; se vero tantummodo puellam captare, vt ex illa haeredes haberet.[4]

---

[3]*Op. cit.*, p. 117.

[4]Bk. II, chap xi. I have followed the Latin text of Geoffrey as given in *Scriptores Rerum Britannicarum* (Heidelberg, 1587), a copy

To one phrase in this sentence I would call particular attention. Geoffrey tells us that Aganippus possessed "tertiam partem Galliae." Apparently in Geoffrey's account, as in the commentary of Caesar, "Gallia omnis" is divided "in tres partes," over one of which Aganippus rules. Now these words have generally escaped critics of Geoffrey. Perrett, for example, though noting carefully Geoffrey's words on other points, nowhere quotes this sentence. Indeed, some of the later chroniclers represent Geoffrey as saying that Gaul at this time had twelve princes, of whom Aganippus was one.[5] I can find no basis for this assertion in Geoffrey's account of Leir. Such a statement Geoffrey does make with reference to Gallia in the time of Brutus (Bk. I. chap. xiii), but Brutus far antedates Leir's reign.

Which third of Gallia did Aganippus possess? Here Geoffrey gives us little assistance, although he does state that Aganippus and his Queen later gave Leir the power of all Gaul ("potestatem totius Galliae"), and that Aganippus sent messengers throughout Gaul ("per universam Galliam") to procure help against the wicked sisters. But would not one naturally assume that this "rex Francorum" had his seat of government in Paris, capital of the Frankish kingdom under Clovis as early as A.D. 508, and, therefore, that Aganippus ruled Middle Gaul? Such assumptions are consistent with certain later interpretations of Geoffrey's story.

One of the French chroniclers who followed and imitated Geoffrey was Jean Waurin, who composed about 1571 his *Recueil des croniques et anchiennes istories de la Grant*

---

of which is in the Library of the University of Texas. The wording is apparently the same in San Marte's Halle edition of Geoffrey (1854), quoted in Bode's *Die Learsage vor Shakespeare* (Halle, 1904), pp. 57-58. The reading also conforms with Giles's English translation in *Six Old English Chronicles*, 1866 (Bohn's Library).

[5]See, for example, Holinshed's *Seconde Booke of the Historie of England* (ed. 1587), chap. v: "This Aganippus was one of the twelve kings that ruled Gallia in those daies, as in the British historie it is recorded."

Bretaigne. Writing of Queen Cordeilla's struggle with her nephews after Leir's death, Waurin observes:

> Toutesvoyes en la fin, par laide des Francois qui lui vindrent aidier et secourir, cest a scavoir le duc de Sens, le duc de Laon, et le conte de Corbueil, lesquelz elle avoit nouris en sa jonesse, elle vint audessus de sa guerre et prinst ses deux nepveux en battaille.[6]

Now if the Duke of Sens, the Duke of Laon, and the Count of Corbueil were brought up in their youth by Cordeilla, her capital was not far from Paris, and she must have been Queen of Central Gaul. Of course, such an inference, based on a French version that came two and a half centuries after Geoffrey, does not prove that he established precisely the same metes and bounds. But the sentence does confirm an impression that Geoffrey's words are very likely to convey. No reader of Caesar will forget that the middle part of Gaul is denominated Gallia Celtica, the northern part Belgia, and the southern part Aquitania. If I could be fully persuaded of the historical truth of Geoffrey, I should be thoroughly convinced that Aganippus governed the central division of Gaul.

II

Spenser's "Celtica"

Only once in Spenser's brief version of the Leir story does he name either Aganippus or his land. Then he writes simply:

> But without dowre the wise Cordelia
> Was sent to Aganip of Celtica.[7]

Most editions of Spenser that I have seen pass these lines without comment. Professor R. E. Neil Dodge glosses

---

[6] *Op. cit.*, ed Hardy, W., in Rolls Series, vol. xxxix, part 1, p. 92.

[7] *The Faerie Queene*, Bk. II, canto x, stanza 29. In the first edition (1590), a copy of which is in the Wrenn Library of the University of Texas, the word is spelled "Aggannip," but the second edition (1596) corrects this to "Aganip," and the correction stands in the Folios of 1609 and 1611.

"Celtica" as "France,"[8] in accord with other versions of the same story. Perrett, we have seen, recognizes a real difficulty, which he is unable to explain; and, by her silence, Dr. Harper seems to take the same view.

But would Spenser, who from his life in Ireland, even before 1590, was much interested in the Celts and Celtic peoples and languages, confuse Celtica with Gallia, or use the two words interchangeably? On general grounds, I think not. Fortunately this opinion is strengthened by a passage from Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland* (written about 1596) in which both Belgia and Celtica are mentioned as parts of Gallia:

> Besides, ther be many places as havens, hills, townes, and castles, which yet beare names from the Gaules, of the which Buchanan reherseth above 300 in Scotland, and I can (I thinke) recount neere as manie in Ireland which retaine the old denomination of the Gaules, as the Menapii, the Cauci, the Venti, and others; by all which and many other very reasonable probabilityes (which this short course will not suffer to be layed foorth) it appeareth that the chief inhabitauntes in Ireland were Gaules, coming thither first out of Spayne, and afterwardes from besides Tanais, where the Gothes, the Hunnes, and the Getes sate downe, they also being (as it is sayd of some) auncient Gaules; and lastly passing out of Gallia it self, from all the seacoste of Belgia and Celtica, into al the southerne coastes of Ireland.[9]

By "Celtica," then, in my opinion, Spenser means the central division of Gaul. So careful a student as he probably noted the effect of Geoffrey's words as he read them in the Latin. For, says Dr. Harper, "We may conclude . . . that Spenser's version of the Lear story is in general outline based directly on Geoffrey's, which, by condensation, however, is somewhat modified."[10] Such an interpretation of his diction as I have given would fall in with the previous argument. One does not risk much in

---

[8]*The Poetical Works of Spenser* (Cambridge Poets, 1908), p. 794.

[9]Globe edition of Spenser, p. 628. For this interesting passage, I am indebted to my colleague, Dr. F. F. Covington, Jr., who has for several years been engaged in intensive study of the *View*.

[10]*Sources of Spenser's British Chronicle*, p. 83.

assuming also that Spenser knew his Caesar, and had learned something about Belgia, Celtica, and Aquitania.

III

The "Genouestan Gawles"

The pre-Shakespearian play of *King Leir* (about 1592-4) has for its chief sources, as Perrett has convincingly shown, three poetic versions of the legend, viz., Higgins's *Mirror for Magistrates,* Warner's *Albion's England,* and Spenser's *Faerie Queene.* Perrett also points out that in his *Albion's England* Warner uses the phrase "Cenouesean Gawles" in connection with the reign of Brennus, one of the successors of Leir; and so, Perrett thinks, the anonymous author of the play borrowed the phrase from Warner, which his printer read "Genouestan Gawles." This suggestion of Perrett is adopted by Sir Sidney Lee in a note already quoted. But Sir Sidney adds: "The phrase is difficult to explain . . . Neither form is quite comprehensible." Let us examine each form.

The phrase is used towards the end of the old play by Lord Mumford, commander of the French army, in addressing his soldiers, who are about to make war on the British. He begins:

> And now to you, my worthy Countrymen,
> Ye valiant race of *Genouestan Gawles.*[11]

The true explanation, I think, was at Sir Sidney Lee's hand when he alluded to Warner's account of King Brennus. Fabyan's *English Chronicle* (1516), discussing the warlike deeds of Bren, states:

> For ye shall understande, that at those dayes as testifieth *Eutropius* and other wryters, the Gallis occupyed dyuers Countres: and therefore *Titus liuius* which wrote the Actes & dedes of the Romayns made distinccion of the Gallis, and nameth theym that Brenne ladde, whan he besegyd ye Capitoill, Cenouenses Galli, which is to name the Gallis of that Countre where the

[11] *King Leir and His Three Daughters,* ll. 2417-2418, Malone Society Reprints (London, 1907); ed. Lee, Sidney (London and New York, 1909), Act V, sc. vii, ll. 28-29.

> Cytie of Cena than stode & yet dothe as testyfieth ye auctour of Cronica Cronicarum and other in a Countre Italye named at this Ethruria.[12]

Fabyan, it will be noted, spells "Cenouenses" and "Cena" with the same initial as Warner does the "Cenouesean," but Richard Grafton in taking over this sentence from Fabyan into his Chronicle (1568) spelt both words with an initial *S*. So Geoffrey of Monmouth in his narrative of Brennius, *Historia Regum Britanniae*, writes of "Brennium Senonesque Gallos,"[13] and Holinshed puts it "the people called Galli Senones."[14]

Now the Galli Senones, unlike Leir and Brennus, are altogether historical, and their valor is well established. Says the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in an anonymous article:

> SENONES, in ancient geography, a Celtic people of Gallia Celtica, who in Cæsar's time inhabited the district which now includes the departments of Seine-et-Marne, Loiret, and Yonne. From 53-51 B.C. they were engaged in hostilities with Caesar, brought about by their expulsion of Cavarinus, whom he had appointed their king. In the last-named year a Senonian named Drappes threatened the Provincia, but was captured and starved himself to death.[15]

The *Britannica* then states that a branch of these Galli Senones invaded Etruria in B.C. 391, besieged Clusium, and in the following year defeated the Romans, who had come to help the Clusines. Here we have the historical basis for the story of Brennus and his victory over the Romans.

In other words, the actual Senones occupied a part of Gallia which now includes the city of Paris and that of Orleans. If, then, the author of *King Leir* thought of the Gallic army as recruited from the neighborhood of Paris, he might well term them a "valiant race of Cenouesean Gawles." That he did write "Cenouesean" or else "Cenouesian," and have the word misprinted "Genouestan," as Per-

---

[12]Fabyan, *op. cit.*, ed. Ellis (London, 1811), p. 22.

[13]*Op cit.*, Bk. III, chap. ix.

[14]*Holinshed's Chronicle*, ed., Ellis, Bk. III, chap. iv, p. 456.

[15]*Op. cit.*, 11th edition, vol. XXIV, p. 647.

rett suggests, I am the more persuaded by a slight circumstance unknown, apparently, to both Perrett and Lee. This is that in two early editions of *Albion's England* the very phrase "Cenouesean Gawles" is printed "Genouesean Gawles." These are the editions of 1602 and 1612, both of which I have examined with care. Unfortunately the error seems not to have been made in any edition of Warner that the composer of *Leir* might have seen before writing his play.[16]

Sir Sidney Lee's further statement that "the French prince . . . has no obvious relation with a region so far to the south" as Orleans, seems to me a peculiarly unhappy assertion. Apparently Sir Sidney has in mind the fact that the Gallian King in the play easily reaches Calais or a neighboring seaport, and the journey would not be so short if his capital were in mid-Gallia. This appears to me to involve ill reckoning of the geographical knowledge, or, let us say, fancy of the normal Elizabethan. To him space had few limitations. The author of the *Leir*, I believe, conceived of the King and Cordella as ruling in Paris, or in some neighboring town of Gallia Celtica.

IV

Shakespeare's "Burgundy"

In Shakespeare's tragedy of *King Lear*, Cordelia's husband is neither Celtica nor Gallia, but consistently the King of France. One may, therefore, suppose that the tradition

---

[16]A copy of the 1602 edition, once owned by the late G. A. Aitken, is in the Aitken Collection of the University of Texas Library. A copy of the 1612 edition, once owned by Robert Southey, I have seen in the Harvard University Library. In the summer of 1906 Mr. Herbert Tollman, then librarian of Mr. Christie-Miller's private library at Britwell Court, kindly examined for me copies of the 1586, 1589, 1592, 1597, and 1602 editions there, and wrote that "in all our copies except that of 1602," he found the reading "Cenouesean." I believe, of course, that the playwright used one of these earlier editions, and that the coincidence of the misprints is accidental, occasioned probably by the resemblance to "Genoesian," pertaining to Genoa.

of a seat of government in or near Paris, and the dominion over a third part of Gaul in no manner influenced Shakespeare's version of the tale. Perhaps so. Yet one of Shakespeare's contributions to the love-test incident is the person of Burgundy, a new and hitherto unmentioned rival to France, his equal, to all appearance, in dignity, though not, like France, a king. The character of Burgundy deserves more study than I have seen given to him.

Burgundy, who appears only in the opening scene of the play, is the marked opposite of France. He "strives to be interess'd" to Lear's youngest daughter because of "respects of fortune"; he is willing to take her as his duchess if Lear will make good his previous offer of dowry, but when that offer is withdrawn, Cordelia loses a prospective husband. Thus his offer of marriage is purely mercenary and political; it has naught to do with love. France, knowing his character, offers first choice of the lady to Burgundy under these changed conditions, satisfied that he will refuse her hand. So Shakespeare uses the Duke as a foil to France in order to stress the ideal love of the King.

All this points to the conclusion that France is not the over-lord of Burgundy, duke though the latter be. Where, then, lies his duchy? Is Schmidt correct in his gloss of the word Burgundy in his *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, a "country between France and Germany"?[17] I think not. Lear's words, "the vines of France and milk of Burgundy,"[18] draw the just observation of Moberly: "Shakespeare may have thought of the pastoral countries of Southern Belgium as forming part of Burgundy (as they did till the death of Charles the Bold, 1477)."[19] It is the same land of Burgundy that Shakespeare has in mind in *Richard the Third*, I. iv. 10, where Clarence, telling his dream declares:

> Methoughts that I had broken from the Tower
> And was embark'd to cross to Burgundy.

---

[17]*Shakespeare-Lexicon* (Berlin and London, 1874), p. 154.

[18]*King Lear*, I. i. 86.

[19]Cited by Furness, *Variorum King Lear* (Philadelphia, 1880), p. 15.

Indeed, reference to Bartlett's concordance reveals no single mention by Shakespeare of Burgundy except in the *Lear,* in *Henry the Fifth,* in the *First* and *Third Parts of Henry the Sixth,* and in the line from *Richard the Third* just quoted. That is to say, outside of this tragedy, Shakespeare always conceives of the Duchy of Burgundy as that ruled by Philip the Good and his son, Charles the Bold, fifteenth century rivals of France and for a time allied with England in war against the French. Philip the Good is that Duke of Burgundy who appears in *Henry the Fifth* to urge the marriage of King Henry to Katherine of France, and again in *Henry the Sixth* to desert the English in time of war at the persuasion of Joan of Arc. Charles the Bold actually married Margaret of York, sister of Edward IV and Richard III. Certainly it does not strain probability to suggest that Shakespeare had studied the lives of both these masters of political intrigue in composing his earlier "histories," and so held in mind their characters when he created the Burgundy of the *Lear.*

It is a well-known historical fact that the strongest ambition of Duke Charles, an ambition shared likewise by his father, Duke Philip, was to establish a kingdom which should rival that of France. In the words of one historian, Charles aimed to "reunite Burgundy with the northern group of her possessions (Flanders, Brabant, etc.) and to obtain the emperor's recognition of the kingdom of 'Belgian Gaul.' "[20] Now, "Belgian Gaul" in the north certainly suggests "Celtic Gaul" as its southern rival. Shakespeare is not far from the traditional division.

This is not an effort to prove that all versions of the Leir story, or even most of them, identify France with Gallia Celtica. It is an argument that Caesar's tripartite Gaul is recognized in Geoffrey and in some of his successors, probably influencing Spenser, the anonymous playwright, and, perhaps, even Shakespeare to think of France in Leir's time as only the central division of that land.

---

[20]Rene Poupardin in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* eleventh edition, IV, p. 822.

BUNYAN'S MR. BADMAN AND THE PICARESQUE NOVEL

By James Blanton Wharey

There has been a strange tendency on the part of historians of English prose fiction to minimize, if not wholly to ignore, Bunyan's influence upon the development of the novel. The more one looks into the matter, however, the more convinced one becomes that his influence was considerable. Recognition of this fact, though tardily given, is characteristic of the more recent studies of the novel. Mr. Saintsbury,[1] for example, writes:

> Disregarding prejudice and punctilio, every one must surely see that, in diminishing measure, even the *Holy War* is a novel, and that the *Pilgrim's Progress* has every one of the four requisites—plot, character, description, and dialogue—while one of these requisites—character with its accessory manners—is further developed in the *History of Mr. Badman* after a fashion for which we shall look vainly in any division of European literature (except drama) before it.

This last named work, *The Life and Death of Mr. Badman,* Professor Chandler,[2] some six years prior to the statement just quoted, had characterised as "a Puritan romance of roguery." Indeed it was the paragraph in the *Literature of Roguery* from which this phrase is taken that first led me to examine the affiliations of Bunyan's allegory with the picaresque type of novel.

I

For the picaresque story in its simplest and most primitive form we must turn to Spain. *Lazarillo de Tormes,* a small, unpretentious book of unknown authorship, first published—it is believed—in 1553, has the distinction of being the first picaresque novel. Many of the elements of the story can be traced to earlier productions, but this little

---

[1] *The English Novel,* The Channels of English Literature Series, London, 1913, p. 54.

[2] *The Literature of Roguery,* New York, 1907, I, p. 225.

book is the first to choose its hero from the very dregs of human society and through him to satirize the various social classes of the time.

Both the times and the country were favorable for such a production. Spain, impoverished by long-continued wars, swarmed with half-starved mendicants and idlers. For the thousands of rogues and rascals that overran the country the chief business in life was to stay the pangs of an empty belly, the readiest means being by the wits rather than by honest work. The outstanding traits of this sixteenth century rogue-story are:

(1) It is told in the first person. This point of view is consistently adhered to throughout the whole narrative.

(2) The narrator, who is the hero of the story, is of low origin; his father was a thief, his mother not adverse to an illicit union.

(3) The hero is a rogue, but a rogue from necessity rather than choice. When it is possible to live an honest life, he lives it. His rogueries, almost without exception, grow out of his efforts to ward off hunger.

(4) The story, which is an account of the hero's experiences with seven successive masters,—a Blind Man, a Priest, an impoverished Squire, a Friar, a Pardoner, a Chaplain, and a Constable,—is loosely constructed. It could be continued almost indefinitely. The end depends upon the caprice of the author, not upon the logical necessity of events.

(5) The interest of the story is two-fold: (a) in the roguish tricks of the hero, (b) in the pungent satire directed against the social conditions of the age. The picture of the starving squire and his brave attempt to keep up appearances is unforgettable.

(6) The story is thoroughly realistic; not the faintest touch of idealism occurs anywhere in it.

(7) The language and style of the book are adapted to the popular taste. "In all Spanish literature, at least in

prose," writes a Romance scholar,[3] "we find no other work written in such simple language and unaffected style."

The attempts at continuation, the many editions, the numerous translations and imitations of the *Lazarillo*—all attest the deep impression created by this little volume. The trail blazed by its unknown author was further cleared in 1599 by the publication of Mateo Aleman's *Guzman de Alfarache,* a far more ambitious attempt than the earlier work. Guzman, though of illegitimate birth, comes of a higher social station than Lazaro. Nor does he, as did Lazaro, adopt a roguish career from necessity. Part I recounts the beginnings of his rogue's life in Spain, his service with various masters and the cheats played them, and finally his varied experiences in Italy, first with a begging fraternity, and then as servant, respectively, to a Cardinal and to the French Ambassador.

In the Second Part, published in 1605, Guzman, after varied experiences in Florence, Siena, and Bologna, reaches Madrid. Here he sets up in trade, marries, but, staking too high hopes upon his wife's dowry, fails. He attempts to save himself through bankruptcy. Upon the death of his wife, he matriculates in the University of Alcala. He marries a second wife, his landlady's daughter, who makes a cuckold of him and in Seville deserts him for a ship master. Guzman returns to his knavish tricks, but is finally cap tured and sent to the galleys. He regains his freedom by divulging a plot of his fellow-convicts to turn over the ship to the Turks. With the promise of still a third part, fortunately never fulfilled, the story ends.

Widely different as *Lazarillo de Tormes* and *Guzman de Alfarache* are, the basic idea is the same: to present a satirical picture of the social conditions of the time through the eyes of a rogue. Aleman has presented his story in the form of an autobiography. His hero is a rogue, but a rogue from choice rather than from necessity. He has placed less stress, in the Second Part at least, upon the hero's serv-

---

[3]Fonger de Haan, *An Outline of the History of the Novela Picaresca in Spain,* Johns Hopkins Dissertation, 1895, p. 12.

ice with various masters and more stress upon the hero's character and activities. His story is less unified than the *Lazarillo,* in that digressions and episodes are freely admitted.

Lazarillo and *Guzman* represent the earliest and most primitive examples of the picaresque story. They head the long line of romances of roguery written not only in Spain but in all the countries of Western Europe. The numerous translations into English of the *Lazarillo* and the *Guzman* are sufficient evidence of the favorable reception accorded the rogue story in this land, where the common people enjoyed a freedom and an independence unknown in other countries and where conditions were ripe for the development of the realistic novel.

II

"Before the advent of Defoe," writes Chandler in his *Literature of Roguery,*[4] "the last decade of the Sixteenth Century and the sixth of the Seventeenth were alone fruitful for the English romance of roguery. Each decade was signalized by a characteristic work, the first by 'The Unfortunate Traveller' of Thomas Nashe, the second by 'The English Rogue' of Richard Head and Francis Kirkman. Between these two periods the picaresque tradition was kept alive only by native anatomies of roguery, criminal biographies, and plays, and by foreign rogue novels in translation."

Robert Greene played all about the picaresque novel without ever actually writing one. His Cony-Catching pamphlets evince his keen interest in rogues and his possession of material out of which several such novels might have been constructed. His nearest approach to the type is found in *The Life and Death of Ned Browne,* the full title of which is: "The Black Bookes Messenger Laying Open the

[4]I, p. 192.

Life and Death of Ned Browne,[5] one of the most Notable Cut-purses, Crossbiters, and Conny-Catchers that ever lived in England."

Ned Browne, unlike Lazaro, comes of honest parents, but from his earliest years is addicted to petty sins, which increase in heinousness with his age. By the time he is eighteen there is no wickedness he will not attempt. He becomes adept in the cutting of purses, stealing of horses, picking of locks, and boon companion of crossbiters and harlots. He marries one of the latter, but soon tiring of her remembers the old proverb "that changing of pasture makes fat calves." He tells with great gusto how he outwitted a priest, and cut the purse of a gentlewoman. He goes to France, robs a church, and—we are told by the author—is hanged. His body is scratched from the grave by ravenous wolves and devoured "as a man not worthy to be admitted to the honor of any buryall." The story closes in characteristically picaresque fashion with the author's wish that the reader may profit by the example of the hero.

To Thomas Nashe, however, belongs the distinction of having produced the first well-defined picaresque novel in England—first in time and first in importance until the advent of *Moll Flanders*. *The Unfortunate Traveller* or *The Life of Jacke Wilton* ran through two editions in 1594, the year of its birth. The earlier edition contains a dedication, omitted from the second, to the Earl of Southampton, in which the author declares that all he can promise in "this phantasticall treatise," written in a "different vaine" from his other writings, "is some reasonable conveyance of historie and varietie of mirth."[6]

---

[5]This was a favorite title in rogue literature of the Seventeenth Century; cf., for example, *Life and Death of Gamaliel Ratsey* (1605); *Life and Death of Griffin Flood* (1623); *Life and Death of James Turner* (1663); *Life and Death of the English Rogue* (1679); *Life and Death of William Longbeard* (1579); *Life and Death of Young Lazarillo* (1688); *Life and Death of Mr. Badman* (1680).

[6]*The Unfortunate Traveller* or the *Life of Jacke Wilton* by Thomas Nashe, edited by H. F. B. Brett-Smith, M. Percy Reprints, No. 1 Oxford, 1920.

In the *Unfortunate Traveller* one scarcely recognizes the type of rogue story seen in *Lazarillo de Tormes;*[7] save for the fact that he tells his own story, Jacke Wilton has little in common with Lazaro. He belongs to the court circles; Lazaro comes of low origin. He is often moneyless, but never in actual want; Lazaro suffers continually from actual hunger. He has but one master, whom he not only does not satirize but for whom he entertains great admiration and respect, not to say affection; Lazaro had seven masters, all of whom are the objects of his satire and for none of whom he has any regard. Jack's wanderings cover the whole of Western Europe; Lazaro's, a very restricted portion of Spain. Jack's account of his rogueries, or rather pranks, constitutes a small part of his narrative; Lazaro's story is made up almost wholly of his knavish tricks to satisfy hunger.

The satirizing of the various classes of society, so marked in the *Lazarillo,* is wanting. In its stead we have satirizing of the Anabaptists of Munster, of the University pedants of Wittenberg, of travelers in foreign lands, of the Italians. In one very important respect the *Unfortunate Traveller* preserves the tradition established by the earlier picaresque story: it is realistic. Despite Nashe's abhorrence of imitating Lily,[8] his hero indulges at times in euphuisms, but in describing the battlefields of France and of Munster, the ravages of the plague in Rome, the crimes and death of the Spaniard Esdras, and the execution of Cutwolfe, he is grimly real. In some of the most gruesome parts of the narrative, there is a jaunty, rollicking, devil-may-care tone that would appeal strongly to the populace. Nashe's employment of concrete details, homely illustrations, racy, picturesque diction makes plausible Chandler's assertion that

---

[7]It should be remembered that by 1594 the *Lazarillo* was the sole example of the Spanish picaresque novel. Nashe's story preceded the *Guzman* by five years.

[8]"*Euphues* I readd when I was a little ape in Cambridge, and then I thought it was *Ipse-ille;* it may be excellent good skill for ought I know, for I lookt not on it this ten yeare; but to imitate it I abhorre." —*Strange Newes,* 1592.

"Had he [Nashe] but cultivated fiction as assiduously as he wooed controversy with Gabriel Harvey and in the Martin Marprelate affair, he might have been the magic midwife to have delivered the English novel a century and a quarter before DeFoe."[9]

Seventy-one years intervene between Nashe's *Jack Wilton* and the second most important example of the English picaresque novel prior to DeFoe. In 1665, Richard Head, an insignificant hack writer, published Part I of *The English Rogue Described in the Life of Meriton Latroon, a Witty Extravagant.* Part II, the work of Francis Kirkman, appeared in 1668; Parts III and IV, apparently the work of the two together, in 1674 and 1680, respectively. A reading of the four parts convinces me that Chandler's criticism, severe as it is, is too mild. The work is, as he describes it, "less a novel than a chaotic collection of all the picaresque tricks on record at the moment of its publication."[10] Practically all the stories are salacious, some brutal, others simply nasty. Only Part I, which alone is occupied with the doings of the hero, concerns us here. Meriton Latroon, a bastard, begins his roguish life with boyish thefts. He runs away from school, joins a band of gypsies, and is trained in all "the arts of begging and stealing." He enters the service of a merchant, from whom he steals and whose maid he gets with child. He again runs away, and dressed as a woman secures a position as maid in a girls' boarding school. Here he finds an unlimited field for his activities. He decides to return to his former master, but soon makes a cuckold of him. He becomes suddenly pious, marries, as he supposes, a woman of wealth—in reality a common bawd. By pretended bankruptcy he succeeds in cheating his creditors and greatly enriching himself. After various escapades he becomes a highwayman, is caught, carried to Newgate, and condemned to be hanged. He is granted a reprieve, banished, and shipwrecked on a voyage to the East Indies. The picaro has ceased to be a

---

[9] *Literature of Roguery*, I, p. 192.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 211.

mere rogue; he has become a villain that hesitates at no crime, however black.

The amazing thing about this wretched book is the popularity it met with. Editions of the whole were published in 1674 and 1680, and abridgements in 1679, 1688, and 1689.[11] There is every reason to believe that in England popular interest in rogue literature was at its height during the latter half of the Seventeenth Century. In 1680, there came from a quarter least expected a book which sought to capitalize this interest in behalf of moral reform.

Bunyan's *Life and Death of Mr. Badman,* published in 1680, falls exactly midway between the *Pilgrim's Progress,* Part I (1678), and the *Holy War* (1682). It was intended, he declares in the "Address to the Reader,"[12] as a counterpart to the *Progress.* It was the customary thing for authors of picaresque stories to claim for their work a moral purpose. Even Kirkman in his preface to the vulgar third part of *The English Rogue,* writes, "I hope all persons who make use of this book to practice debaucheries will be induced to forbear and decline their wickedness, lest a just judgment overtake them, as they will find it hath done these extravagants."[13] Bunyan, likewise, declares that he has traced the life of Mr. Badman from his childhood to the grave in order that the reader may see with his own eyes "the steps that take hold of hell," and discern whether he is "treading in his path thereto." Inasmuch as Badman left a numerous progeny and has kindred not only in every town but in every family, the butt he is shooting at is a wide one. "I cannot but think that this shot will light upon many, since our fields are so full of this game."

One of the characteristics of the picaresque novel, as we have seen, is the satirizing of the age to which it belongs. That Bunyan intended in his little book to pillory the evils

---

[11]*The English Rogue* was reprinted, in four volumes, by Pearson, London, 1874.

[12]George Offor, *Works of Bunyan,* III, p. 590.

[13]Quoted by Chandler, *Literature of Roguery,* I, p. 218. Cf. Introduction to *Guzman de Alfarache, ibid.,* p. 225.

of his day is clear from the first reason he assigns for publishing it: "For that wickedness, like a flood, is like to drown our English world. It begins already to be above the tops of the mountains; it has almost swallowed up all; our youth, middle age, old age, and all are almost carried away of this flood. O debauchery, debauchery, what hast thou done in England! Thou hast corrupted our young men, and hast made our old men beasts; thou hast deflowered our virgins, and hast made matrons bawds . . . well, I have written, and by God's assistance shall pray that this flood may abate in England."[14]

Realism, another characteristic of the rogue story, is claimed by Bunyan for his *Mr. Badman*: "Yea, I may truly say that to the best of my remembrance, all the things that here I discourse of, I mean as to matter of fact, have been acted upon the stage of this world, even many times before mine eyes."[15]

In form, *Mr. Badman* is a distinct departure from the picaresque type. Instead of being an autobiography, it is in dialogue—a form which Bunyan declares he adopted in order that he "might with more ease to himself, and pleasure to the reader, perform the work." As for the pleasure of the reader, Bunyan is, I think, mistaken. Had he chosen to write it as autobiography, the long and numerous moralizings, the chief bane of the story—at least in the eyes of Badman's numerous progeny—would have been impossible. As I have pointed out in a previous article,[16] the framework is that of Dent's *Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven*,—a book the influence of which is clearly seen throughout the whole allegory.

Unlike the usual picaro, Badman comes of thoroughly respectable and pious parents. Despite his careful rearing, he was bad from the beginning, indeed "a ringleader" and "master-sinner from a child,"—a fact which both Mr. Wiseman and Mr. Attentive agree can be accounted for

---

[14]Offor, III, pp. 529-3.

[15]*Ibid.*, p. 590.

[16]*Modern Language Notes*, February, 1921, XXXVI, pp. 65-79.

only on the basis of original sin. Even as a child, he was an unconscionable liar and pilferer, at first of trifles, later of things of more value. "He took at last great pleasure in robbing of gardens and orchards; and as he grew up, to steal pullen from the neighborhood." Nor did he hesitate to steal from his own father. "Alas, alas, he swarmed with sins, even as a beggar does with vermin, and that when he was but a boy." Listening to sermons, reading the Scriptures, observing the Sabbath, he could not endure, but "to swear and curse was as natural to him as to eat, and drink, and sleep."

Badman's first apprenticeship was with a very kind and considerate master. This master took a personal interest in him, providing him with good books and taking him with him to hear sermons. As for good books, Badman would not even look into them, but devoured all the bad and abominable books he could find, such as "beastly romances and books full of ribaldry," and as for church, he would either fall fast asleep or "whisper and giggle till such time as sermon was done."

Badman now made the acquaintance of three young villains who "taught him to be an arch, a chief one in all their ways." The first was addicted to uncleanness, the second to drunkenness, the third to purloining and stealing from his master. Badman "became a frequenter of taverns and tippling-houses, and would stay there until he was even as drunk as a beast." He became, too, a ringleader "in the beastly sin of whoredom." At last Badman's ways became so odious to his master and his master's ways so unendurable to him, that he ran away three several times. The third time his master let him go.

His second master was a very different type of man from the first. In fact, he and Badman "were birds of a feather," yet he would often fall out with him, and "sometimes beat him too for his naughty doings." This was not at all strange, since his young apprentice "was for neglecting of his master's business, for going to the whorehouse, for beguiling his master, for attempting to debauch his daughters and the like." Yet he served out his apprenticeship,

for "this last master . . . would tell Mr. Badman of his sins in Mr. Badman's own dialect; he would swear, and curse, and damn, when he told him of his sins, and this he could bear better, than to be told of them after a godly sort." Under the tutelage of this master, Badman "became a sinner in grain." "I think," adds Mr. Wiseman, "he had a bastard laid to his charge before he came out of his time."

His apprenticeship over, Badman, with the two hundred pounds given him by his father, set up in business for himself. But through poor management and extravagance he was set down almost as soon as he had set up. His new companions would "egg him into the ale-houses, . . . yet make him Jack-pay-for-all." They flattered him for his "wit, manhood, and personage; and this was like stroking him over the face." He was as proud as ever, "only he went now like a tired jade, the devil had rid him almost off his legs."

He determined to repair his fortunes by marrying a rich wife. There happened to be in the neighborhood a wealthy lass, but very religious. Upon the advice of his trusty companions, Badman began to assume the role of a very pious suitor. The girl, an unsuspecting orphan, gave him her hand and her portion. Her dowry was soon squandered in payment of debts, and now Badman threw off all semblance of religion. "He . . . began . . . to go out a-nights to those drabs who were his familiars before, with whom he would stay sometimes till mid-night, and sometimes till morning, and then would come home as drunk as a swine."

Having a little of his wife's money left over after paying his debts, Badman started up in business again. He was deeper in debt than ever. But he hit upon a scheme by which he got "hatfuls of money." After noising it around that he was bankrupt, he began to send his creditors "mournful sugared letters" with the assurance that "he bore towards all men an honest mind, and would pay so far as he was able." After much threatening and fuming, his creditors finally agreed to five shillings in the pound. And then Mr. Badman could "put his head out a

doors again, and be a better man than when he shut up shop, by several thousands of pounds."

Badman had still other ways of enriching himself. He had buying weights and selling weights; the first were too big, the second too little. He also kept false accounts. He was never clever, however, in cheating his customers under the mask of religion, as were so many arch villains of the time. These would hide their knaveries under the cloak of religion, and if discovered either made amends or laid the blame upon servants. "And so Mr. Cheat shall stand for a right honest man in the eye of his customer, though the next time he shall pick his pocket again."

Badman was, too, an extortioner.[17] "Could he get a man at advantage . . . he would surely make his purse strings crack." With all of Badman's wickedness, he was exceedingly proud and haughty. "He counted himself as wise as the wisest in the country, as good as the best, and as beautiful as he that had most of it." The only occasions on which Badman ever showed any remorse, so far as Mr. Wiseman could remember, were when he broke his leg while riding home drunk from the alehouse, and when he fell sick of a dangerous illness. Before his leg was healed his conscience became choked, and as soon as he began to recover from his illness he returned to his wallowing in the mire. His good wife, made despondent by his moral relapse, died broken-hearted. For a long while thereafter he remained a widower, but having promised in a drunken spree to marry one of his punks he was forced to make her his wife. She was as vile as he, but he dared not reproach her; ". . . she could lay in his dish the whores that one knew he haunted, and she could fit him also with cursing and swearing, for she would give him oath for oath, and curse for curse." After some fourteen or sixteen years of a perfect cat-and-dog life, they separated, he to go with his whores,

---

[17]From the long discussion that now follows in regard to "righteous trading," it is evident that profiteering is by no means of recent origin. Bunyan strongly condemns the principle of buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest.

she with her rogues. Seized with consumption, Badman rapidly wasted away, finally dying "like a lamb, or . . . like a chrisom-child, quietly and without fear."

There are certain features of Bunyan's *Mr. Badman* that would seem to exclude it from the picaresque category. It is not an autobiography, and far more important still, there is not the slightest sympathy with the hero's villainies. On the contrary, the writer's purpose is to depict a life so mean and ignoble as to repel any possible imitators. This, as we have seen, is the avowed purpose of the genuinely picaresque novels, but this purpose is not lived up to in the body of the work.

On the other hand, there can be no doubt of its close kinship to the picaresque type. The story has as its protagonist, not a hero, but an anti-hero. Beginning life as a thief and a rogue, Badman grows to be a villain, though never overstepping the bounds of the civil law.[18] The robbing of orchards and hen-roosts, the apprenticeships and consequent cheating of his masters, his illicit relations with women, his marriage for money, his false bankruptcy, his short-lived repentance, and his impenitent death,—these are all parts of the picaresque machinery. The interpolated stories, drawn from Bunyan's own experience and from Clarke's *Looking Glass for Saints and Sinners,* are reminiscent of the stories and episodes introduced into the picaro's narratives. Precisely in line, too, with the picaresque novel is the bald realism of the story: "The drawing is so good," writes Froude, "the details so minute, the conception so unexaggerated, that we are disposed to believe that we must have a real history before us." May we not paraphrase the remark already quoted from Chandler concerning Thomas Nashe: Had Bunyan cultivated fiction as assiduously as he tried to turn men from the primrose path into the way of the New Jerusalem, *he* might have been the magic midwife to deliver the English novel nearly a half-century before Defoe?

---

[18]"A vulgar, middle-class, unprincipled scoundrel," Froude calls him, in his *Life of Bunyan,* Chapter VII.

THE SYLVAN DREAM: OR, THE MOURNING MUSES

Reprinted with Notes

By R. H. Griffith

The *Sylvan Dream* was published as a folio pamphlet in 1701, and it has not until now, so far as I know, been reprinted. My interest in the poem is the offspring of a note written on his copy by the late George A. Aitken, suggesting that the author was John Philips, famous for his imitations of Milton; and my decision to reprint it grows out of the wish to render it accessible to scholars who are interested in the work of Philips's age, and may have power to determine its authorship. If it is by Philips—the probability that it is, does not look strong to me—the poem is of interest as his first production, and as the only one of his English compositions yet brought to light that is not in blank verse. Independently of the authorship, it is not unpleasant to read a poem composed under Greek influence in an age so predominantly Latinized, even though there is a very considerable deal of the poem that needs rather to be forgiven than praised. And, finally, the strictures upon the immorality of the stage and upon the low estate of the poetic reputation in 1701 offer a documentary pennyworth to the students of those topics.

Mr. Aitken wrote the article on John Philips (Dec. 30, 1676-Feb. 15, 1709) in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (Vol. XLV, 1896), and in it does not mention the *Sylvan Dream*. Possibly he knew the poem at that time, and did not wish to commit himself in print; possibly he made acquaintance with the *Dream* later. At some time whether earlier or later he secured a copy of the folio pamphlet,[1] and made on it the notation in script referred to above, which reads thus:

---

[1]Mr. Aitken's library *en bloc* became a part of the library of the University of Texas in 1920.

Welsted, in "A Poem to the Memory of the incomparable Mr. Philips," 1710, after mentioning "Blenheim," "Cider," &c., says,

> But hear, oh hear the Mourning Muse relate
> Our once young Churchill's and our Gloster's fate,[2]
> . . .

---

[2]A|Poem|To|The|Memory|Of the Incomparable|Mr. Philips,|Humbly Inscrib'd to the Right Honourable|Henry St.John Esq;|[two Latin quotations Hor.Lib.I.Od.24. Virg.,Ecc.4]|—|London,|Printed for Daniel Browne at the Black Swan|Without Temple-Bar, and Sold by A. Bald-|win at the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-lane, 1710.

Folio:4 sheets. Signatures:[A]-D,in 2's. Pages:[i-iv];1-12. Contents: Page 1, titlepage; ii,blank;iii-iv,dedication,signed "Leonard Welsted"; 1-12,text of the poem. Lines:1-301, not numbered, in heroic couplets,with five triplets. Condition: unbound,uncut; leaves measure 13 3/16x8 10/16 inches.

Other lines of Welsted characterize Philips and also the contemporary stage and poetic conditions:

(Page 4, lines 86ff.)

> How nobly daring in thy pompous Page
> The German and the Brittish Prince engage?
> With what impetuous Force and Rage divine
> The Gallick and confederate Squadrons joyn?
> To Worlds unborn our Deathless Fame is told,
> And *Blenheim* will be young, when time is old.
> But hear, oh hear, the Mourning Muse relate
> Our once young *Churchill*'s and our *Gloster*'s Fate.
> Less sad is *Philomel*'s Nocturnal Tune,
> Less sad the Musick of a dying Swan;
> Involv'd in pleasing Pangs the Reader lyes,
> And languishing on every Accent dyes.
> Each Word revives indulgent ANNA's Pain,
> And makes her act the Mother o're again;
> The Mourning Victor drops his laurel Crown,
> Proclaims thy Conquest and forgets his own.

There follow comments upon *Blenheim* and *Cyder*, and upon Philips's unsuccessful suit to "Maria." Then, pages 6-7:

> To speak thee generous, loyal, just and true,
> A Constant Friend and not unfriendly Foe
> Were with superfluous Trouble here annext,
> And but a Comment on a canvass'd Text.
> But that Religion, Piety and Zeal
> Should influence thy Life and guide thy Will,

This confirms a MS. note in the British Mus. copy,[3] attributing this "Sylvan Dream" to Philips.

The imprint is curious, as Philips is not known to have had any connection with Sheffield.

Another contemporary, Edmund Smith,[4] lived in a much closer intimacy with Philips; he survived him only

---

Was wondrous strange! A Bard devout and good!
Why 'tis a Crime unpardonably rude:
To the BEAU MONDE, the polish'd World a jest;
Uncomplaisant and singular at best,
But monstrous in these lewd unrighteous Times,
When the vile Muse's prostituted rhimes
Become subservient to Dishonours Rise,
Turn Pimps to Lechery and Bawds to Vice;
When Priests and Poets are at open breach,
And the Stage censures what the Pulpits teach;
When Bawdy tickles wanton Woman's Vein,
And none is witty that is not prophane.
'Twas wondrous strange in such an Age, that you
A Wit, a Lover, and a Poet too
Should stand conform'd to strict Religion's Laws,
And shun the fashionable Sins of those,
Whose Maxims are to live by Natures Rule,
That the poor Parson is the Statesman's Tool;
That Priesthood then began to flourish most,
And find encrease, tho' at the People's Cost,
When subtle Knaves and Politicians found,
Mankind by Laws restrain'd, by Conscience bound,
Themselves in more Security might reign,
And Priests perceiv'd, that *Godliness was gain.*
Yet ev'n in this degenerate *Æra* cast,
Thy Muse was modest as thy Manners chast;
Whatever, tho' in sportive Mood, she said,
By Matrons might be spoke, by Virgins read:
An Emblem of thyself in her we see;
Wise were thy Pleasures and thy Wisdom free.

[3]Listed under "Dream" in the printed catalogue of books (Part Dou-Dro, 1887) and under "Philips, John" (Part Phi-Phl, 1894); but in neither case is there any allusion to the manuscript note mentioned by Aitken. The *Dream* is not mentioned in the *Cambridge History of English Literature.*

[4]Smith, known as "Rag" Smith among his friends, was a good deal of a character. His slovenliness and impecuniosity were the direct begetters of Philips's "Splendid Shilling."

a few months, but long enough to write a poem[5] eulogizing his friend's memory. A passage in it is not wholly without ambiguity,[6] but appears to refer to the "Sylvan Dream."

> Oh! might I paint him in Miltonian Verse,
> With Strains like those he sung on Glo'ster's Hearse!
> But with the meaner Tribe I'm forc'd to chime,
> And wanting Strength to rise, descend to Rhyme.
> With other Fire his glorious *Blenheim* shines,
> And all the Battle thunders in his Lines;
> His nervous Verse . . .[7]

The third contemporary allusion is quite opposed to this attribution of the poem to Philips. It is the statement[8] of his earliest biographer, George Sewell:

> By all the Enquiry I could make, I have not found that he ever wrote any Thing more than what we have

---

[5]"Mr. Smith being invited soon after Philips's death to dine with the Principal of Brazen-Nose College, Dr. Robert Shippen, was there decoyed into a promise of doing justice to his friend's memory, and was detained in the Principal's lodge with the lock turned upon him for three days, at the end of which he produced the poem." Philips's *Works*, 1781, 12mo., Bell's edition, page xii, note.

[6]The ambiguity lies in the reference on the one hand to "strains on Glo'ster" as if they were in blank verse, whereas the "Dream" is in rhyme; and on the other hand to "Blenheim" as shining with "other fire," though a passage of a few lines in that poem (290-311) describes the ghosts of the Duke of Gloucester and the Marquis of Blandford among the shades. "Other fire" may be a contrast between *Blenheim* and Smith's own lines.

[7]Reprinted in the editions of Smith's *Works*, the poem was originally published separately as:

A|Poem|On the Death of|Mr. John Philips,|Author of the| Splendid Shilling, Blenheim and Cyder.|—|. By Mr. Edmund Smith. |—| [Latin quotation]|[Ornament]|London:|Printed for Bernard Lintott at the Cross-Keys between|the two Temple Gates in Fleet-street.

First edition. Published in February, 1710. Folio: four sheets. Signatures: 1 leaf; B-D; 1 leaf. Pages: [i-ii]; 1-13; [14]. Contents: Page i, titlepage; ii, blank; 1-13, text of the poem; 14, blank. Lines: 1-234, not numbered; in heroic couplets, with fourteen triplets.

[8]In the "Life of Mr. John Philips" prefixed to the first collective edition of Philips's *Poems* (London, Curll, 1715; in the 1728 edition, pages 27-28).

> mentioned,[9] nor indeed if there are any, am I very solicitous about them, being convinced that these are all which he finished, and it would be an Injury to his Ashes to print any imperfect Sketches which he never designed for the Publick. It might, perhaps, please some to see the first Essays of a great Genius, but considering how apt we are to impose upon ourselves and others in Matters of that kind, it is unfair to hazard the Reputation of the Writer for the Fancy of the Reader.

Dr. Sewell's words have something the appearance of a caveat, but the history of "Cerealia,"[10] a poem that also eluded the Doctor's enquiry, has already discredited his negative.

The fourth contemporary allusion is directly to the poem, but leaves the authorship still unsettled. It is a derisive critique of some length, written by Mrs. Elizabeth Thomas (the "Corinna" of Dryden, Curll, and Pope) in a letter to Richard Gwinnett and published in *Pylades and Corinna.*

---

[9]"The Splendid Shilling," published under the title of merely "Imitation of Milton" in *A New Miscellany Of Original Poems, On Several Occasions . . . London, Printed for Peter Buck . . . and George Strahan . . .1701,* pages 212-221, and, according to the *D.N.B.,* in a *Collection of Poems . . . London . . . D. Brown . . . and B. Tooke . . . 1701* (which I have not seen), and in a surreptitious edition of 1705, and in an authorized edition in 1705; in all cases anonymously.

"Blenheim," 1705, folio, anonymous; second edition, 1705, folio, anonymous.

"Cyder," 1708, octavo, anonymous.

And a Latin "Ode" to Bolingbroke.

[10]Cerealia: |—|An Imitation|Of|Milton:|=|[2 lines of Latin—Petronius.]|=|London,|Printed for Thomas Bennet, at the Half-Moon in|St. Paul's Church-yard. 1706.

(Bennet was also the publisher of "Blenheim.") "Cerealia" made its first appearance among Philips's poems in the *Poetical Works Of John Philips,* in Bell's series, printed at the "Apollo Press, by the Martins, Dec. 1, 1781," where it is accompanied by this foot-note: "This poem is taken from a folio copy 1706, communicated from the Lambeth Library by Dr. Ducarel, in which the name of Philips was inserted in the handwriting of Archbishop Tennison."

LETTER III

A Second CRITIQUE, *on the* Writings *of the* POETASTER, *before mentioned.* (See pag. 53.) *On the* Post-Angel. *Of* PHILOMELA *(i.e. Mrs. Elizabeth Singer, &c.)*

THIS frugal Bard has given us a meer OLIO of POETRY. Here is *Burlesque, Elegiac, Jambic, Lyric,* and *Panegyric,* which *last* is designed for his MAJESTY, and begins thus,

> This, This is He!
> The great Nassovian! this the mighty Thing,
> I chuse in Numbers unconfin'd to Sing.

But to omit his comparing the King's Merit to a stormy Sea, (and the Poet's Thoughts to mutinous Soldiers flying out of their Trenches, hovering round their Officers for their Pay, thickening the Air, attempting to besiege the Skies, and all the rest of these tremendous Metaphors) I will only mention the four concluding Lines,

> These fighting Cullies by Experience find,
> [and three more lines].

If the Author of this is not some stroling Mountebank, or conceited Apothecary, I am strangely Mistaken, but let him be who he will (if one may be allowed to use that Expression) I would ask you, if this is not a new-fashioned *Elogium?* . . . [Two pages further of quotation and comment follow.]

This Anonymous *What d'ye Call it,* has half cured me of the *Spleen,* and afforded me such Diversion; that I read it to my good Lady *Delawar,* . . . [Another page of comment.]

Next, to this *Yorkshire* Author, I think I may bring in the POST-ANGEL, which I am credibly informed is written by *John Dunton.* . . .

Pages 184-188.

Pylades and Corinna was published by Curll in July, 1731, six months after Corinna's decease, and was probably edited by him. The heading to "Letter III," as just quoted, was probably the work of Curll. It asserts that the ensuing remarks were a continuation of a discussion begun on page 53. But the assertion appears to me to be certainly wrong. The passage on page 53 was indubitably written in the year 1704, and is an amusing account of a poetaster named Fowler. The passage just quoted (from pages 184ff.) appears to have been written earlier than 1704, probably in 1701 or 1702: witness the allusions to King William as "his Majesty" and "the King" as if still alive, and the reference in the present tense to the *Post-Angel,* a monthly magazine that began in January, 1701, and succumbed with the June issue of 1702. It is evident that the "anonymous" author of the *Sylvan Dream* was unknown to Mrs. Thomas, and that he was not Fowler,[11] as a reader of *Pylades and Corinna* might at first conclude.

---

[11]Fowler is not recorded in any work of reference available to me. He may or may not be the John Fowler who wrote *The Last Guinea,* a poem that went through two editions in 1720 in London, another in Edinburgh in 1727, and a "Fourth Edition" in Edinburgh in 1763. He was a Yorkshire man if Mrs. Thomas's comment on page 188 is about Fowler; but her Yorkshire reference may be based on the "Sheffield, Yorkshire" in the imprint on the titlepage of the *Dream* —which puzzled Mr. Aitken. Fowler was an acquaintance of Mrs. Thomas for some years, though not a highly valued one. "However," she wrote (page 53), "since he had been so civil as to give me a Cessation of Torment [his calls at her home] for the last two years, I whetted my Patience and went into the Parlour, where I found the Courteous Animal, and according to Custom, both Pockets stuffed out with Poetry like an Attorney's Term-bag, and all for the unfortunate *Corinna* to correct, or at least hear read." If Fowler brought the *Dream* to the notice of Mrs. Thomas not as the writer of it but merely as the procurer of it from the author, then there is ground for suspecting him of having been the collector (editor) of the poems in the volume published by Peter Buck and George Strahan in 1701 (see foot-note No. 9, above); for in that *Miscellany* Philips's "Splendid Shilling" (cf. the title of John Fowler's *Last Guinea)* is printed on pages 212-221, and immediately preceding it, on pages 202-211, there is a poem "On The Death Of His Highness The Duke of Gloucester. By Mr. George Gefferies Of Trinity College in Cambridge,"

The subject matter of the *Sylvan Dream* progresses in five movements, or develops five themes:—

Lines 1-25—The poet, wandering in a woods, finds a sylvan bower, and dreams.

Lines 26-124—Phoebus, seen and heard in the dream, mourns the low estate of poetry.

Lines 125-164—Phoebus seeks for a subject worthy of a poem.

Lines 165-276—The praise of King William is sung.

Lines 277-472—In an elegiac idyll Venus, Pan, Cupid, and Diana mourns the death of Adonis, *i.e.*, the Duke of Gloucester.[12]

---

which if it never rises so high as does the *Dream* in some strains, yet never sinks so low, and would have enjoyed an editorial preference for that reason.

[12]Gloucester, son of Princess (later Queen) Anne, was by the Act of Succession in the direct line to the throne. His life was very important in the estimation of most Englishmen as being their strongest hope against disturbances likely to be raised by the partisans of the prince later known as the Old Pretender. The boy Duke died, in the beginning of his twelfth year, on July 29, 1700.

The|Sylvan D r e a m | Or, The|Mourning Muses.|A|Poem.|—| [One line Latin; one line Greek.—Bionis, Idyl. I.]

London,|Printed for Joseph Turner, Bookseller in Sheffield, Yorkshire;|and are to be Sold by A. Baldwin, at the Oxford-Arms|in Warwick-Lane. MDCCI.

Folio: six sheets. Signatures: [A]-F, in 2's. Pages: [i-iv]; 1-19;20. Water-mark; "MT" [or "MLT"?]. Contents: Page i, titlepage; ii, blank; iii-iv, Preface; 1-19, text of the poem; 20, blank. Lines: 1-472, none numbered. Condition of this copy: unbound, clean; edges uncut; leaves measure $11^{18}/_{16}$x$7^{14}/_{16}$ inches. MS. notes in contemporary(?) hand: "6*d*", at top of titlepage; "20. Aug." beside the year-date on titlepage.

Published anonymously (compare the "Beggarly Fool" of the Preface), and perhaps piratically, though the presence of a preface gives weight to the supposition that the poem was intended for print; there is some reason (internal evidence) to believe the author did not read proof for the piece.

In the reprint that follows, the running-title, signature marks, and catch-words of the original are omitted. The original issue contains no foot-notes.

(Pages [III-IV])

The|Preface

What I have written is not design'd to confront every nice pickering Caviller, *nor am I concern'd to Humour the vain Minds of the trifling* Criticks *of the Age; Nay, I should think it a hard* Task *to please all of the most* Candid: *My Business is to profit, and give a* Lift *(tho' in another* Kind) *to the so desired* Reformation. Poetry *has been a long time on the* Declining *hand, not so much for want of* Genius's, *for there are some true ones; but by reason of their* Abuse, *and the* Spurious Multiplication *of Counterfeit Ones: Tho' it's one of the most unaccountable things in the World; it's neither Money nor Money-worth that they counterfeit; and rather a piece of* Folly *to be laugh'd at, than a* Crime *to be hang'd for; yet they deserve to be hang'd for their* Folly. *It's These that have brought the* Name *into so much Disrepute, that it's become one of the greatest* Scandals *a Man can lie under, to be call'd a* Poet, *it bearing along with it the perfect* Notion *and* Idea *of a* Beggarly Fool.[13] *They, who have* Genius's, *use them contrary to their* Natures, *and make them speak, not* Instructions *to* Mankind, *but what their own base Inclinations prompt them to; yet whatever they write is laid to the Charge of the Innocent* Muses, *who are Ravish'd rather than Courted, and made a* Sacrifice *rather than sacrific'd unto.* Plays *were at first design'd for a good End; but how are they degenerated! How has the Subject* Love *been jaded,* Vices *approv'd and commended, and thereby the* Minds *of our* Nobility *and* Gentry *cheated and polluted! I am not rashly for Voting the* Houses[14] *down, let those who know Nothing of Them absolutely rail against them; If they can be reform'd and brought entirely up to their first* Innocence, Modesty *and* Usefulness, *let them* Stand; *otherwise, a Putrify'd Member that's past healing must be cut off, lest it infect the whole* Body. *I wish to see* Poets *reform'd, and then I question*

---

[13]See lines 68ff. of the poem, and note 2, *supra.*

[14]Drury Lane and Lincoln's Inn Fields theatres.

not but Poetry will be refin'd. The following Poem *how refin'd,* qua Poetry, *I will not say, it's the first that I've attempted, and, it may may be, may be* [sic] *the last; But in Morality and Spirit of a* Poet, *I think it may be no breach of the Rules of* Modesty *to say it's much refin'd; it's vanity to hope to meet with no Enemies, but they that look at* The Design, *that are Friends to Vertue, will be Friends to it, and let the* Criticks *do their worst.*

THE
SYLVAN DREAM, &c.
A POEM

Th' Immortal Youth had newly left the Day,
And Surfeiting in *Thetis* Bosom lay:
A wafting Air spreading a gentle Breez
Was left to sooth and fan the Stately Trees;
Delightful Groves in Nature's Order grew,
Whose various Beauties Admiration drew:
Silent Solemnity with awful Face
Dazles and adds a Lustre to each Grace:
The World seem'd bury'd, or in Mazes lost,
No Noise was heard throughout the Sacred Coast:
I laid me down beneath a spreading Pine,
Whose thick'ning Boughs wreath out a *Sylvan Shrine;*
Vyeing Præeminence in Grandeur stood,
And might alone be well esteem'd a Wood;
The Ground had newly entertain'd a Shower,
Which tap'd the Sweets of ev'ry Spicy Flower:
While hov'ring Roses twisted me a Bower.
Wood-Nymphs and Nightingales in rapt'rous Notes
With Emulation stretch their quav'ring Throats:

[*Page 2*]

The Son'rous Airs of pretty smiling Loves,
The Cooing Kisses of more am'rous Doves,
With soft and charming Joys my Soul possest,
And lull'd my Senses into balmy Rest.
Thus lock'd in Sleep, my Fancy rang'd about
To Mimic these, or find new Pleasures out;
When suddenly - - - - -
Methought I heard a shrill Melodious Voice,
Sad as poor *Philomela* in *Disguise;*
Thro' fourteen several Echoes bandy'd on

My list'ning Ears received the Mournful Tone:
Such Skill I knew with Heav'n Earth could not share,
Nor Human Lungs breathe so Divine an Air;
If so, *Earth*'s Glory might with *Heav'n* compare.
The Voice a *God*, the Style a *Muse* betray'd,
I found 'twas *Phoebus* sat beneath a Shade,
Who thus began - - - - -
Fatigu'd with Troubles and tumultuous Cares,
Jargons of Words waging Perpetual Wars;
The Noise of *Poetry* and *Sence* refin'd,
When empty Skulls let out th' impatient Wind,
Genius and *Stars* remaining still unkind.
Hither, from City Clamours, spent I come,
These *Sylvan* Shades once Grac'd my *Native* Home;
And here my Childhood sweetly I employ'd,
Sported with *Shepherds* and the *Nymphs* decoy'd:
Harmless and Modest as an *Infant* Smiles
When *Mimic* Dream his busy Thought beguiles.

[*Page 8*]

Here first I made the Woods and Forests ring
Themselves, and *Echo* her own Praises sing;
Haunted the Rills, and gentle sliding Streams,
And Beachen Shades chequer'd with scatt'ring Beams.

As once beneath the blossom'd Hawthorn sat
The beauteous *Amaryllis* to repeat;
My shriller Voice as thro' the Vale it went,
And Trees and Cattle to my Musick sent;
Fame catch'd the Blast and modify'd the Air,
To breathe my Name throughout the Hemisphere;
Which quickly call'd me from my bless'd Retreat
To be huzza'd, in Court and City, great;
Where I was cherish'd and brought up with Care,
Fed on the Prince's Favour and his Fare.
And more indeed than these were duly mine,
For I, tho' veil'd in Flesh, am still *Divine*.
None durst pretend a Right to Sacred Fire,
But whom my early Glories did inspire;

And none was *Poetry* but where each Line
Flow'd clear as *Peneus,* beauteous as the *Nine.*
But these bless'd Times are past, *Parnassus* mourns,
Because no *Renovation* Year returns;
Each *Bully* turns a Versifying Chit,
Long swell'd with Hopes to show his Mungril Wit.
Pimps, Panders, Beau's will Poets all commence,
Tho' often damn'd, yet still they'll aim at Sence.

[*Page 4*]

Some *hundreds* may, and do for Poets go,
Are *Phoebus* Sons, tho' *Phoebus* never know;
They're BASTARDS sure, and of the Monstrous Line,
That Sprung when *Nero* coupl'd with the *Nine;*
Folly's their Rage, their *Inspiration* Wine.
And yet these Strumpet *Muses,* dog'rell *Rhimes*
Are *Poetry* in these degen'rate Times.

Oh! how I've heard the ravish'd Muses cry
For some Kind hand, but no such help was nigh.
Minds pure and free from any base Alloys,
Have long been *Prostitutes* to Noble Vice;
Jaded with Meanness, hag'd to Glorify,
And virtuous make the *Sinful Quality;*
The vilest *Rake*'s a *Saint* in *Elegy.*
There's no such thing as Liberty in Love,
Yet they their vitious Liberty improve,
And Smut and Filth make up the *Myrtle Grove.*
Unless the Poem stink there is no Wit,
For *Modesty* is out of *Fashion* quite.
What heaps of *Ribaldry* and saucy *Prate,*
Scold, which would Signalize ev'n *Billingsgate,*
Litigious *Fury,* where the Oyster Wives
Meet Tongue and Teeth, or where the Devil drives!
Satyr on Satyr, satyriz'd again,
Lampoon my Altars and my *Shrines* profane;
Laugh'd at and Scorn'd I am the Ridicule,
Matter for *Sport,* and *Farce* with ev'ry Fool.

[*Page 5*]

To be a Beggar, and of *Phoebus* Race,
Are *Callings* honour'd with the like Disgrace.
I'm a *Game-Bear*, and they to do me right,
Do in both *Houses*[15] bait me every Night.
Hear me, sweet *Echo*, hear, and bless
One that like thy *Narcissus* is;
Pierce the World's *Universal* Ear,
And let my *Pangs* disturb the Air,
And let their dying *Anguish* too,
With *Clangors* pierce it thro' and thro'.
Sweet *Mirth* began my childish Years,
But they must now conclude in Tears,
I'm Gather'd when my Bud but just appears:
My fainting *Spirit* must be gone,
Benighted 'ere my Day be done.
But come, *Thou Genius*, of the Grove,
Help while I Sacrifice to *Jove;*
The Work's too great, and I too Young,
My golden *Harp's* but newly Strung:
If Age had gratify'd my Mind,
I'd done it in a Nobler Kind;
But since I may not pass it by,
But shew my Love before I dy,
I'll try, and will but only try.

I.

Come then, come every *Muse*,
Let's Ransack *Earth*, the *Air* and *Skyes*,
To find a grateful *Sacrifice:*

[*Page 6*]

What Sacred Bullock must be slain?
For Sacred Altars Sacred Blood must stain:
What mighty *Hero's* Praises shall we chase?
Whether to pick out of the golden Line
Where *Greece's* Gyant Race of Worthies shine?

[15]Drury Lane and Lincoln's Inn Fields theatres.

Whom *Fame* decypher'd in her Younger Days,
When first her Roul begun,
Her Trumpet was not known so soon,
So left their Names for after-times to raise.
Or will fair *Amarillis* Sons invite,
And help our Numbers to a cleaner Flight;
Will *Scipio* better Entertainment give,
And bid Laborious Aims, tho' erring, Live?
Or shall the *Carthaginian* be thy Theme,
That us'd to make old *Pluto* yell
With hideous Joy, when in a Pleasant Dream
He saw whole *Miriads* tumbling down to Hell?
Or do the *Caesars* hide thy Choice
In a long succeeding Train?
Or shall we View upon the trembling Plain
The valiant Legions with the roaring Noise
Of Arms and War, trample on *Princes* slain?

II.

In *Mythic* Stories of the *Grecian Sires,*
Let *Pedants* strut it to their wond'ring Boys:
A generous *Muse* disdains *Phantastick* Fires,
A senseless *Theme* the rising *Genius* cloys.

[*Page 7*]

Scipio and *Hannibal* deserve to ride
High charioted, deck'd in Triumphant Pride:
But neither put to a true Judgment's test,
Will meet a strict Enquiry, and commence the best.
No 'tis a *Caesar* must engage my Quill,
In long descent
The quick'ning root had lain
Cover'd with Snow, secure and still;
Till like the sprightly shooting Grain
A *Sprig* at last found out a prosp'rous Vent,
And Honour's Battlements o'retops again.

III.

This, This is He,
The Great *Nassovian!* This the Mighty Thing
I chuse in *Numbers* unconfin'd to Sing!
This is the *Sea* I launch into,
Who's stately rouling Waves no Mercy know;
I venture, tho' the swelling Surge, I see,
Bids me beware of sudden furious Woe.
Miriads of modest Thoughts repair
(Unrhetorick'd, Soldiers in *Thespian* Wars)
To their Commission'd Officers,
Hov'ring about them, thick'ning all the Air:
Their *Chiefs* confus'd stand fix'd in deep dismay
To see too many for the whole Treasury of Words to Pay.
Like Vapours, which when Rays of Light rebound,
Fly on their Wings in Mists from Trenchy Ground;

[*Page 8*]

Twice mediating the *Hemisphere,* they rise
A dark'ning Army to Besiege the Skies.
Ev'n so my Mind
O'reflow'd, but yet with no *Hyperbole,*
With *Topes* encircl'd like *Eternity,*
I neither can End or Beginning find.

IV.

Whether I view Him in the Bloom of Age,
Acting a narrower Part,
And Preluding what after times should see;
'Tis not the Top of *Pegasaean* Art,
Nor Young *Apollo's* height of Rage
Can form in *Words* what we admire in *Re.*
Let *Belgium* monumental Trophies raise,
Huge Piles of stately Buildings to amase,
And only shew the *Greatness* of his Praise:
That They who long to know may there behold
Substantial, what by *Tongue* could not be told:
Except great *Luxemburg,* at who's Command
Thousands of Livery'd *Imps* with Cap in Hand

Stood ready Arm'd, a vast *Infernal* Host,
That spring more swift than Light from Coast to Coast
To do him Service, may perhaps be set
In Hell's mid Courts for ever to repeat
The famous *Conquests* of the great *Nassaw*,
Which may from Hell ev'n Admiration draw;

[*Page 9*]

And for *Eternal Punishment* must tell
How *Luxemburg* beneath his Valour fell:
Indeed He easier may the Task engage,
Because He is inspir'd with greater Rage;
But I, Poor Infant, I
May not advance so high,
But in so great a Task must only try to Try.

V.

I've been Caress'd in *Princes* Arms,
Prefer'd to *Venus* cloth'd in all her Charms;
Above God *Bacchus*, or the *Boy* rever'd,
Material Graces all my Lines appear'd:
Because my scented Song
Could trace each Action thro' the Throng,
Omit no Circumstance.
But ev'ry *Virtue* to its height advance;
Exploits were Thin, and full of *Vices* too,
My *Numbers* rather did the *Theme* outgo.
So once I Rhapsody'd the Wars of *Troy*,
But scarce could *Virtue* find
Sufficient to instruct Mankind,
And constitute my *Poetry*.
And after I *Augustus* Prais'd,
And to his Name my solid Trophies rais'd,
Which, till Succeeding Ages all be past,
And Time itself run dry, shall ever last.

[*Page 10*]

But 'tis impossible to raise
Notes due to this our *Caesar's* Praise,

That Glorifies these latter days:
Or if I could, amaz'd Posterity
Would give my cursed Pen (tho' innocent) the Lye.

VI.

Or if the latter Scene
Display *Him* seated on the *English* Throne,
Looking a true Heroic mien,
And shining in the Rays of *Actions* done;
Yet this too Percussive light
Is for an *Infant Muse* too bright,
And will endanger my but now acquired Sight.
Much less could I endure
To hear *Bellona's* thund'ring Tone,
Scarring the World into a dismal Groan,
Roaring out Victory as loud as sure.
When e're he marches *Europe* stands alarm'd,
Whether in League or Foes,
The first are glad, and Stoop to be unarm'd,
What *Britains* Arms can do the rest he shews;
And not a Man dare Say his Soul's his own.
These fighting *Cullies* by *Experience* find
His strong *Cathartic Face* so troubles them behind,
In fearful *Fits* making their Grumblers roar,
They dare not see *Him,* but upon the *Necessary* Door.

[*Page 11*]

VII.

But look again my *Song,*
Here's fresh Advantage for a wond'ring Eye;
Behold the Mad confused Throng
Of hect'ring Blades in haste retreat,
And glad they can their former Steps repeat,
Who *furious* came thro' Blood and Spoil
To take and re-inslave our Isle,
Hibernia knows *He's great,* and why.
While Others come to ask for Peace,
Knowing where true *Religion* rules
Humanity sets up her Schools,

And *Mercy's* Laws a Noble Spirit please;
He smiles, and to the World pronounces *Peace*
The *Realms* above resound and Echo *Peace:*
Fame blew her Trumpet to the list'ning Thrones,
Cheer'd up their Kings, and fix'd their tott'ring Crowns.
Loud *Acclamations* from each Realm affright
Thick Sorrows back into the Womb of *Night.*
Children with *Olives* wreath'd Sing to his Fame,
In pretty Harmony
They Tune the Songs of Jubilee,
Ev'n so, poor Infant, I have strove to lisp his Name.

But come again, come every *Muse,*
Let's Sing till Time and Breath refuse.

[*Page 12*]

I've Sung but little in my Life,
It's been so short, and throng'd with Grief.
Now whilst my Hours are hasting on,
My tedious Journey yet undone,
I will in *Numbers* my last *Vigils* keep,
In Swan-like Raptures lull my Soul asleep.
We'll Charm the Night, and till the Morn appears,
Each mournful Measure shall flow down in Tears.
Kind *Echo* hear, and chanting *Philomel*
Attend, for You and You alone can tell
The utmost Dolours of a Passing Bell.
We'll Sing how *Venus* and her jocund Lad
Forgot to Smile, and mourn'd *Adonis* dead.
How *Pan,* great *Pan,* forsook the Shepherd's Care.
And Sympathizing, bore an equal Share.

I'd newly whip'd, and loos'ned every Rein
To speed my Chariot tow'rds the Western Main;
When suddenly I spy'd the Queen of Love
Sit Sad and Silent in th' *Idalian* Grove;
One like my Self lay bleeding by her Side,
As seem'd the very *Spark* of *Nature's* Pride:
To know the cause I threw my Whip away,

Catch'd up the Reins, and stop'd the furious Day.
She wept a while, then rose, and *Duty* paid
To Parent *Heav'n*, She mourn'd a Voice, and said,
Great HEAV'N, I bow before thy *Sov'reign Right*,
If *Truth* and *Goodness* still be thy Delight,
Relieve or hide me in Eternal Night.

[*Page 13*]

She Reverence paid again, and sat her down;
And having dry'd her Eyes, she thus went on;
When will this Boy loaden with Lilies come?
For I have drain'd my Eyes before the Tomb.
Into what distant Valley is he flown?
Is all this Country's *Pride* faded and gone?
Cloath'd in her Morning Blush this pleasant Field
To th' *Hesper* Walks, tho' Fair, would never yield;
And is it now lay'd Wast? Sure all the Flowers
Consent to mourn this woful fate of *Ours*.

The *Sylvan* God had travell'd o're the Coast,
Found all Things fading and his Labours crost,
Was much concern'd, and fear'd his Godhead lost.
He now was walking Softly on the Grove,
And deeply *musing* what They thought *above:*
What strange Affairs were fallen out of late,
Or what should mean these new Decrees of Fate:
When strait the Voice of *Venus* reach'd his Ears,
Refresh'd his Mind and scatter'd all his Fears;
He knew the Voice, and from Her, what and how
Concerns went on in Heav'n He hop'd to know.
He mends his Speed and hastens tow'rds the Place,
Which seem'd not distant far from where He was,
And drawing near, He with a decent Bow
Congratulates her Presence here below.

Pan. Welcom, fair Goddess, to this happy Shade,
Where *Innocence* may rest her un-afraid.

[*Page 14*]

You come, I trust in *Goodness* (as before)
Joy to these *Country* Pastures to restore,
While every *Nymph* and *Swain* hast to adore.
But tell me, beauteous Goddess, why those Eyes
Languish in Sorrow, veil'd in sad Disguise:
How is that Godlike *Air* and *Grace Divine*
Sully'd, while *Beauty* do's her Head decline.
The *Reason* is not *mean,* no little *Pain*
Could such *Divinity* with *Weakness* stain.

Venus. No, *Pan,* my Grief is great, my Loss is more;
Ah, Nothing, Nothing were those *Pangs* I bore
When Infant *Cupid* first crept into Light,
Rushing in *Travail* thro' the Womb of Night.
Less was that *Grief* which did the World betray
To Darkness, when dull *Phoebus* threw away
The fiery Reins, and stop'd the Course of Day.
Grief, which to Trees the *Royal* Sisters turn'd,
Who Noble *Phaeton* in Cypress mourn'd,
Was but a *Passion Fit;* while mine alone
Strives to obdurate, and Lament in Stone.
Was not my Mould *immortal,* unalloy'd
To Earth, I had dissolv'd in *Tears* and dy'd.

Pan. I find those Omens now were not in vain;
Cupid I saw wander on yonder Plain
Some Miles from hence, and hung his pretty Wings,
Gath'ring *sweet Flowers,* but neither smiles nor sings.

[*Page 15*]

One while he sits, and funeral *Flourets* weaves,
Sprinkling with *Nectarous Tears* the fragrant Leaves;
Then let's a budded *Tulip* fall, and cries
So falls the *Youth,* so fair *Adonis* dies.
The Name *Adonis* chill'd my glowing Blood,
Gazing, and half entranc'd, I wond'ring stood,
Troubl'd at's Looks, but more at what He said,
But pass'd, nor could believe *Adonis* dead:

A willing disbelief possess'd my Mind,
But ah! his Fate too true too soon I find.
Well may your Tenderness melt down in Tears,
When such a *Flower* in blooming disappears.
But say, *Bless'd Power,* what was the curs'd Design
Durst once Attempt a Nature so *Divine?*

Venus. I am the *Mystick Roll,* where such as You
May read in *Hieroglyphicks,* Plain and true.
Words are too low, You may behold as well
What is an Agonizing Pain to tell.
'Tis no Delight, as *Mortal Females* do,
To whine the *Story* to dissolve the *Woe:*
I'd rather sit dry-ey'd without a Tear,
In Silence mourn and Think for ever here.
'Tis eas'ly guess'd his Sad untimely *Fall*
Was neither *Age*'s due, nor *Natural.*
Had He declin'd, and laid *Heav'ns* Blessing down,
When *Age* began to stoop beneath a Crown;
Had all His waiting *Glories* yet Unborn
But shown *Themselves* along the rising *Morn,*

[*Page 16*]

And every *Modest Grace,* that lurk'd unknown,
Exerted to adorn a smiling *Throne;*
Tho' *Heav'n* had then *transform'd* him to a Star,
And kiss'd *Him* from my Eyes in *Peace* or *War,*
I should have humbly laid my Self before
Th' *Imperial Throne,* his *Pleasure* to adore;
And long *Posterity* would love to tell
How great He stood, and how renown'd He fell.
But to be crop'd when *Youth* began to Bloom,
And leave my wid'ning Heart an empty Room:
To spoil my wealthy Hopes, so fill'd and blest,
And leave my *Arms* to circle o're my *Brest,*
Is what I grieve, and tho' the *Fates* are just,
I wish to fall, and mingle *Dust* with *Dust:*
But here's the Boy; Come Child, why was your Stay
So long?

Cupid. I had a long and tedious Way.
You sent me to the *Meadows* in the Vale
Barren, and wasted thick with Storms of Hail.
I wander'd o'er the *Hills,* thro' *Wood* and *Grove,*
Where that stern *Boar,* where *Wolves* and *Tygers* rove.
And as I *pass'd,* Pardon my *Fault,* if one,
I often *stay'd* to hear the mournful Tone
Of sweet consenting *Voices* in a *Maze,*
Spread from their *leavy* thick-set *Palaces:*
Each *Sonnetier* his hansel'd Voice devotes
From *Vernal Airs* to *Tautologick Notes.*

[*Page 17*]

The *Pines* and *Olives* lowre their new-blown Sails,
And hang their *fading heads* thro' all the Vales.
The green enamell'd *Meads* begin to change,
And *Joy* to ev'ry *Shepherd's Pipe* grows strange.
From thence I rov'd some Miles, where all appear'd
A *Monument* of *Sorrow* newly rear'd.
At length I met along fair *Tempe's* Plain
The Virgin Goddess follow'd by her Train
Of frowning *Nymphs,* had I my *Quiver* there,
I would have made each Heart thy *Shrines* revere:
She call'd, I at my usual *Distance* stood,
And told Her why my Steps appear'd so rude;
And as I told my *Story,* gentle *Sighs*
Would from her heaving *Bosom* seem to rise,
But check'd, stood broken in her wat'ry Eyes.
She gave me these in haste, and bid me go,
As if She could not bear to hear my *Story* thro'.

Venus. Ye *Sylvan Choires,* hang down your Wings and Mourn,
Observe each *Funeral Right* till I return.
Come, Boy, bring all my pretty *Humerous* Loves,
The *vigorous* Sparrows and *cajouling* Doves;
Let *Them* forget to Love, no Kiss nor Coo
Must once be heard, do Thou lay by thy Bow.

And for these *Obsequies,* we will desire
That *Pan* would do 's the Favour to retire.
This last and dearest Service I must bear,
And be exceeding in my Sorrow here.

[*Page 18*]

Boy, reach the *Flowers,* we'll heap them on his Grave,
Poor mark of *Love,* yet all that *Death* can crave.
But finer *Flowers* dy'd with a Scarlet Stain
Shall scatter *Odours* sweet as *Nect'rous Rain,*
Before the circling Year commence again.

Well, Well, He's gone, with Him a *Kingdom*'s gone,
For who can fill the wide Capacious Throne?
Would I the Blessing, *Death,* might now obtain,
For *Immortality*'s become my Pain!
I'd freely change the *Realms* of *Bliss* Above
T'enjoy *Elysium* with my better Love.
But 'tis Decreed by just *Eternal Fate,*
My *Happiness* must center in my *State:*
And I must ev'n in *Sorrow Virtuous* be,
Or else I'm neither *Man* nor *Deity.*

My *Lungs* grow faint, I must my *Post* resign,
Cast off this *Flesh* and be all o're *Divine.*

But hear, ye *Muses,* hear the *Charge* I give,
For you must to *Life*'s fixed *Limits* live.
Some *Friends* I leave behind, tho' very few,
The Care of *Them* I recommend to you,
Who's Loyal *Souls* remain for ever true.
Labour by *Them,* all Ways and Means devise
To Quell the *Fury* of the *raging Vice:*
And if you can to *Our* first Age attain,
Perhaps in *Time* I may descend again;

[*Page 19*]

If not, Leave the decrepid World, and be
Partakers of a State of *Peace* with me:

Till then Farewell, I Question not your Trust,
But you'll be chast as *Virgins*, and as just.
And, as He spoke, *Aurora* spread the Day,
He gasp'd, and fled upon the darted Ray.

FINIS

NOTES ON BYRON

By Fannie E. Ratchford

1. Concerning Byron's quarrel with Southey and Murray.

Recently, while going through the original manuscript of Byron's *Sardanapalus*,[1] I found bound up with it the first draft of the third division of the Appendix attached to *The Two Foscari*, containing a paragraph which does not appear in the published text. This paragraph, of little importance in itself, is of interest in connection with the long quarrel with Southey which occasioned it.

The quarrel between the two poets had its origin in Byron's mistaken belief that Southey, on his return from the Continent, in 1817, had spread a slanderous report concerning himself and Shelley. When dispatching the manuscript of *Don Juan* to his publisher, John Murray, he sent with it a dedication to Southey so savage and so bitter as to seem "more like a mixture of wormwood and verdigrease than satire," and wrote in explanation:[2]

> I have given it to Master Southey, and he shall have more before I have done with him. I understand that the scoundrel said, on his return from Switzerland two years ago, that Shelley and I were in "a league of incest," etc. He is a burning liar! . . .
>
> You may make what I say here as public as you please—more particularly to Southey, whom I look upon, and will say as publically, to be a dirty lying rascal; and will prove it in ink—or in his blood, if I did not believe him to be too much of a poet to risk it.

After a long correspondence, Byron yielded to Murray's advice that *Don Juan* be brought out anonymously, and withdrew his ultimatum that the poem should not be published without the Dedication.[3]

---

[1] One of the items lent by Mrs. W. H. Stark, of Orange, Texas, for the Byron Centenary Exhibition, held in the Wrenn Library, April 19, 1924.

[2] Byron's *Letters and Journals*, ed. Prothero, IV, p. 271.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 294.

> In that case you will omit the dedication to Southey; I won't attack the dog so fiercely without putting my name—THAT is reviewer's work; so you may publish the poem without the dedication stanzas.

The stanzas were omitted, but Southey heard of the Dedication, and, two years later, repaid "some of his obligation to Lord Byron" by a Preface to *The Vision of Judgement,* published April 11, 1821, in which he passes from an explanation and defence of his use of the English hexameter in the poem to an attack on the new school of poetry headed by Byron. He characterizes the poetry of this school as "a monstrous combination of horror and mockery, lewdness and impiety," and Byron and his followers as men "of diseased hearts and depraved imaginations," and launched against them his notorious phrase, "The Satanic School," ending his arraignment of their teaching with the warning, "Let the state look to this in time."

Byron replied to this in his Appendix to *The Two Foscari,* published December 11, 1821, referring to the Laureate as "a turncoat," "an hireling," and "a renegade," and accusing him of scattering abroad calumnies, "knowing them to be such."

In the manuscript, the attack on Southey opens with the unpublished paragraph referred to above.

> Poor Southey, too, in a very *un*heroic preface to his English Hexameters (as he thinks them) has been prating about "a Satanic School" and recommends it to the "notice of the Legislature." Poor fellow! It is sad work to see him reduced to cry upon a government to help him against a few verses. The real sin of "the Satanic School" in his eyes which see *green* in the sunset (I have seen the same in the moon owing to its structure of cheese) is their having impiously and diabolically laughed at the Laureate. What would he have people do? It is for his *friends* to *weep* over him; the rest of the world treat him only too mildly when they limit their notice to contempt. However, he *is right* about the "green hues"—i.e. for I have seen them frequently this very summer, and so has anyone who will observe the sky, at least an Italian sky, at that time, especially with spectacles of the same color. There *are* distinct and even lively green tints after sunset. I have pointed them out to others very lately. He has all the merit of the discovery, however,

> and God knows, he has need of that (merit) or any other to help him through the Slough of Apostacy—a thing (to chop the metaphor) which the English never forgive or forget, because it is the venal resource of the meanest of mankind.

As the manuscript shows no cancellation, this paragraph was probably struck out in the proof, to the credit of Byron's judgment, for manifestly the second paragraph, which was substituted for it, makes a much stronger opening. In a letter to Murray, dated September 9, 1821, Byron says:[4]

> Last week I sent a long note (in English) to the play: let me have a proof of it; but as I am in haste, you can publish the play with the *whole of it, except the part referring* to Southey, to which I wish to add something; and we will append the whole to a reprint. All the part down to where it begins on the rascal will do for publication without my reviewing it.

There were no additions made, rather the subtraction of this paragraph, a change accomplished in time for the whole of the Appendix to appear with the first issue of the play.

This duel of words, continued by Southey's very caustic "direct and positive denial" of the charge of slander published in the *Courier* for January 6, 1822, ended in a clear victory for Byron, with the publication of his *Vision of Judgment* in the first number of the *Liberal,* October 15, 1822.

Following this quarrel, and growing directly out of it, came Byron's quarrel and break with Murray. The manuscript of *The Vision of Judgment* had been sent to Murray, October 4, 1821,[5] with the taunting instruction:

> It may happen that you will be afraid to publish it: in that case find me a publisher, assuring him that, if he gets into a scrape, I will give up *my name* or person. I do not approve of your mode of not putting the publisher's name on title pages (which was unheard of, until you gave yourself that air).

---

[4] *Ibid,* V, p. 360.
[5] *Ibid.,* pp. 386-387.

After nine months of hesitation on the part of the publisher, and many a sarcastic fling from Byron, the latter wrote:[6]

> You will please also deliver to the bearer, Mr. John Hunt, the *Vision of Judgment* by Quevedo Redivivus, with the preface—I mean the corrected copy of the proofs which you had from the Honorable Douglas Kinnaird.

The manuscript was delivered, but without the Preface, even more bitter against Southey than the Appendix to *The Two Foscari.* Hunt, not knowing that there should be a preface, published the poem as the first piece in the first number of the *Liberal.* The omission was wrathfully noted by Byron, and there appeared in the *Examiner,* November 3, 1822, the following paragraph:[7]

> THE LIBERAL
>
> In the first number of this work, just published, there ought to have been a Preface to *The Vision of Judgment,* which would have explained the full spirit of one or two passages that may be misconstrued, and shewn more completely how Mr. Southey has subjected himself and his cause to this sort of attack,—if indeed any such evidence be wanting. The author was somewhat anxious on the former point, lest he should be thought to bear harder than he wished on the late Sovereign. The latter, perhaps, may be explained at once by quoting and applying to Mr. Southey the famous lines about "fools rush in where angels fear to tread." But the fact is, that for some reason best known to himself, Mr. Murray, the bookseller, who was to have been the original publisher of the Vision, contrived to evade sending the preface to the present publisher.

On January 1, 1823, simultaneously with the second number of the *Liberal,* there appeared a second issue of the first number containing the much discussed Preface. This second issue is made up of the sheets of the original issue plus a revised table of contents and errata-list, and an "Advertisement to the Second Edition," which it appears Mr. E. H. Coleridge had not seen when he pre-

---

[6] *Ibid,* VI, p. 93.
[7] *Ibid.,* p. 126.

pared his bibliography of Byron,[8] and which I believe has never been reprinted.[9]

It is necessary to explain the omission in the first edition of the Preface to the *Vision of Judgment,* as well as the cause of those mistakes, obviously too considerable for mere errors of the press, which are noticed in the *errata.* The fact is, that Mr. Murray, the bookseller, who was to have been the original publisher of the Vision, sent the present publisher a copy *not* corrected by the author, and also wanting the Preface,—from which copy the first edition was consequently printed. It was not until after the First Number of the Liberal had appeared, that the publisher was informed that there was a Preface, and that the copy of the poem sent to him to print from, was not the proper copy with necessary corrections by the Author. The only mode left of repairing this mischief, was to print the Preface and the corrections for the poem in a Second Edition, which is now done, and would have been done sooner, but for the time lost,—first, in endeavouring (though unsuccessfully) to obtain the corrected copy, which had passed through the Author's hands,—afterwards of procuring his correction a second time from abroad. The reader need hardly be told, that the Author can with no more justice be held responsible for the mistakes in the first edition, than if his poem had been published at once from his MS. without the proofs being submitted to his revision. And it should be mentioned as aggravating the evil in this case, that the writings of the Author of the Vision of Judgment were mostly printed from the *rough and only manuscripts*—and that consequently he relied on seeing the proof-sheets, in order both to correct the errors of the printer, and to make such alterations as more mature consideration might suggest. This circumstance made it a peculiar duty of the publisher to take every possible care of the proofs corrected by the Author, and especially to see that those proofs alone were followed in the final printing.

January 1st, 1823.

---

[8]The first three leaves of the original issue were thrown away; in their room were placed two leaves, which were a general volume title-page leaf, that probably was printed as M8, and a general, volume contents leaf, that was printed as CC8. (See catalogue of Byron Centenary Exhibition, p. 57.)

[9]Copy in Wrenn Library.

2. On some stanzas from *Don Juan.*

In a letter to Thomas Moore, dated Pisa, July 12, 1822,[10] Byron wrote:

> I wish to know (and request an answer to *that* point) what became of the stanzas to Wellington (intended to open a canto of *Don Juan* with) which I sent you several months ago. If they have fallen into Murray's hands, he and the Tories will suppress them, as these lines rate that hero at his real value. Pray be explicit on this, as I have no other copy, having sent you the original; and if you have them, let me have *that* again, or a *copy* corrected.

The manuscript in question is now in the library of Mrs. W. H. Stark, of Orange, Texas, where I have recently had the pleasure of examining it. It contains ten stanzas numbered and re-numbered as follows:

1

Oh! Wellington—(or "Vilainton"—for Fame
  Sounds the heroic syllables both ways;
France could not even conquer your great name,
  But punned it down to their facetious phrase—
Beating or beater she will laugh the same).
  You have obtained great pensions and much praise:
Glory like yours should any dare gainsay,
  Humanity would rise and thunder—"Ney!" [Note]
[Note: Query *nay?*—Printer's Devil].

2

I don't think you used Kinnaird quite well
  In Marinèt's affair—in fact, 't was shabby
And like some other things won't do to tell
  Upon your tomb in Westminster's old Abbey.
Upon the rest 't is not worth while to dwell,
  Such tales being for the tea-hours of some tabby;
But though your years as *man* tend fast to zero,
  In fact your Grace is still but a *young hero.*

3

Though Britain owes (and pays you, too) so much,
  Yet Europe doubtless owes you greatly more:
You have repaired Legitimacy's Crutch,
  A prop not quite so certain as before;
The Spanish, and the French, as well as Dutch,
  Have seen and felt, how strongly you restore;
And Waterloo has made the world your debtor
  (I wish your bards would sing it rather better).

[10]Byron's *Letters and Journals,* ed. Prothero, VI, p. 96.

4

You are "the best of cutthroats":—do not start;
The phrase is Shakespeare's, and not misapplied:—
War's a brain-scattering, windpipe-splitting art,
Unless her cause by right be sanctified.
If you have acted *once* a generous part,
The World, and not the World's masters, will decide,
And I shall be delighted to learn who,
Save you and yours have gained by Waterloo?

5

I am no flatterer—you've supped full of flattery:
They say you like it too—'t is no great wonder.
He whose whole life has been assault and battery,
At last may get a little tired of thunder;
And swallowing eulogy more than satire, he
May like being praised for every lucky blunder,
Called Saviour of the Nations—not yet saved,—
And Europe's Liberator—still enslaved.

6

I've done. Now go and dine off the plate
Presented by the Prince of the Brazils,
And send the sentinel before your gate
A slice or two from your luxurious meals:
He fought and has not fed so well of late.
Some hunger, too, they say the people feels:—
There is no doubt that you deserve your ration,
But pray give back a little to the nation.

9

I don't mean to reflect—a man so great as
You, my lord Duke! is far above reflection:
The high Roman fashion, too, of Cincinnatus,
With modern history has but little connection:
Though as an Irishman you love potatoes,
You need not take them under your direction;
And half a million for your Sabine farm
Is rather dear!—I'm sure I mean no harm.

10

Great men have ever scorned great recompenses:
Epaminondas saved his Thebes, and died,
Not leaving even his funeral expenses:
George Washington had thanks, and naught besides,
Except the all-cloudless glory (which few men's is)
To free his country: Pitt too had his pride,
And a high-souled Minister of state is
Renowned for ruining Great Britain gratis.

7

But to my Epic—We left Juan sleeping,
Pillowed upon a fair and happy breast,
And watched by eyes that never yet knew weeping,
And loved by a young heart, too deeply blest
To feel the poison through her spirit creeping,
Or know who rested there, a foe to rest,
Had soiled the current of her sinless years,
And turned her pure heart's purest blood to tears!

8

Oh, Love! what is it in this world of ours
Which makes it fatal to be loved? Ah why
With cypress branches hast thou wreathed thy bowers,
And made thy best interpreter a sigh?
As those who dote on odours pluck the flowers,
And place them on their breast—but place to die—
Thus the frail beings we would fondly cherish
Are laid within our bosoms but to perish.

These stanzas were evidently originally intended to open the third canto, for the manuscript is headed, "Don Juan Canto 3 9. July 10th, 1819." Indeed the two referring to Don Juan and Haidee, with slight alteration, were used to open Canto III, though the attack on Wellington was reserved for Canto IX.

The stanzas originally numbered 7 and 8 were renumbered 9 and 10, while two additional stanzas containing the Wellington theme, one of which contains the famous tribute to Washington, were inserted by writing them crosswise over the original ones.

Besides this change in the sequence of stanzas, the manuscript shows several interesting textual changes. The pun on the name of Marechal Ney in the last line of Stanza 1 and the query of the Printer's Devil appear in the manuscript in reverse order from that used in the first edition. The change must have been made in the proof, for the manuscript is uncancelled.

The last two lines of the fifth stanza printed

> Called Saviour of the Nations not yet saved
> And Europe's Liberator still enslaved,

were first written,

> Called Saviour of the Nations not yet saved
> And see his statue raised and print engraved.

The last line of Stanza 6,

> But pray give back a little to the nation,

was changed from

> But pray not at the expense of a whole nation.

The two love stanzas used to open Canto III show some scratching also. The last two lines of the first of these,

> Had soiled the current of her sinless years
> And turned her pure heart's purest blood to tears,

were first written,

> Had sown the ruin of her few fond years,
> And clogged the fountain of sterile tears.

And in the second, the line,

> Ah why
> With cypress branches hast thou wreathed thy bower?

was substituted for

> Ah why
> Beneath the cypress hast thou built thy bower?

The greater portion of the manuscript is in the careless, rapid hand usually found in Byron's manuscripts and letters, but the two last-written stanzas, those written crosswise over the others, are in the careful, even hand which he seems to have reserved for inscriptions in books and other special uses, and show no scratches or changes of any kind.

THE KINSHIP OF HAZLITT AND STEVENSON

By Evert Mordecai Clark

One cannot read the familiar essays of William Hazlitt and Robert Louis Stevenson without observing frequent and rather striking similarities of thought and of expression. Indeed, from these numerous echoes of the earlier in the later essayist, the fact of a somewhat extraordinary influence would be apparent even if Stevenson had not expressly acknowledged such literary kinship. It is the object of the present study to assemble the more important evidences of this relationship, to compare and contrast these two great romantic essayists, and to determine the nature and extent of Stevenson's obligation to Hazlitt, as well as the amount of individuality of thought and style that remains after all deductions for imitation have been made.

In this undertaking we shall make at once the fairest and easiest beginning by hearing the testimony of Stevenson himself. "I should like them to read Hazlitt," says he; "there's a lot of style in Hazlitt."[1] He himself "played the sedulous ape to Hazlitt"[2]; and yet he modestly admits that "though we are mighty fine fellows nowadays, we cannot write like Hazlitt."[3] *On Going a Journey* he thinks "so good that there should be a tax levied on all who have not read it."[4] "And, talking of that," says he, "a volume of Hazlitt's essays would be a capital pocket-book on such a journey."[5] In his youthful *Catalogus Librorum Carissimorum*, Hazlitt's *Table Talk* occupies a conspicuous place. No author does he quote from or allude to more frequently. Haz-

---

[1]Howe, W. D., *Selections from Hazlitt*, p. lvii.

[2]*Memories and Portraits*, p. 57. (References to Stevenson's prose works are to the Autobiographical Edition, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.)

[3]*Virginibus Puerisque*, p. 243.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 237.

[5]*Ibid.*, p. 244.

litt's essay *On the Spirit of Obligations* he considered "a turning-point"[6] in his life. And out of gratitude he enthusiastically set to work upon a biography of the man who had been thus wholesomely influential in the shaping of his style and of his views of life: "I am in treaty with Bentley for a life of Hazlitt!" he writes to Hamerton in 1881. "I love the subject. . . . You know I am a fervent Hazlittite; I mean regarding him as *the* English writer who has had the scantiest justice."[7]

Such are the chief acknowledgments of Stevenson as to his lively interest in and sense of obligation toward his predecessor and mentor in the familiar style; frank utterances that prepare us for the remarkable correspondence that exists in their essays as to subjects, views, and manners of expression.

Perhaps no form of literary composition is less dependent than the personal essay upon the choice of novel and original subjects of discussion; for the familiar essayist deals with profound or trivial or commonplace phenomena of life or nature in the light of his own personality, and it is in the reflection of this personality that his novelty and charm consist. Individualistic, reflective, and sensitive by nature; face to face with the conventional but universal and unsolved problems of life and death and conduct, he quite inevitably keeps turning over and over the common ground of human experience and observation. In the present instance, one must bear in mind the further fact that Stevenson found the personality and mind of Hazlitt especially congenial and stimulating at many points. Thus we find both essayists discoursing—to mention only the more important common topics—upon youth and age, idleness and industry, art, its eternity and satisfactions, the ignorance of the learned, paradox and commonplace, firmness and effeminacy, the love of life and the fear of death, the heroic attitude, basking and meditation, the past and the future, winding roads and solitary walks, our ignorance of

---

[6]*Essays on the Art of Writing*, p. 324.
[7]*Letters*, I, p. 72.

life and death as philosophical abstractions, ideal talk and talkers, disagreeable people, style, the nature of poetry, learning to write, the duty of being happy, favorite books, memories, consistency, failure and success, contentment with the final dissolution and end of all.

Montaigne, it is true, had prattled entertainingly upon most of these and a thousand other subjects of discourse. His reflections about "busy indolence,"[8] excessive "rule and discipline,"[9] "the pleasant season expired,"[10] the "three great commerces,"[11] the "terrible ceremonies"[12] surrounding death, "our fetters"[13] that bind us even upon meandering ways, living "to purpose,"[14] and allowing death to find us "planting cabbages,"[15] will suffice to remind one of the true fountain-head of the familiar essay in modern times. Both Hazlitt and Stevenson acknowledge obligations to "the ever delightful"[16] essays of Montaigne. And yet, notwithstanding this remoter influence, one who reads attentively these two nineteenth-century essayists can hardly escape the conviction that Stevenson's essays often take their form and pressure and to some degree their substance immediately from the essays of Hazlitt. Let us observe in some detail their extraordinary parallelism of idea and expression.

Oftentimes—to begin with the faintest kind of echo—a common note is sounded in the similar use of a favorite quotation, proverb, or allusion. "Those who will not abate an inch in argument," thinks Hazlitt, "ought to be *sent to Coventry*"[17]; and Stevenson reminds that "you can be sent to Coventry for speaking like a fool."[18] "Poetry," says

---

[8]*The Complete Works of Michael De Montaigne,* Ed. by W. Hazlitt, 1889, p. xi.

[9]*Ibid.*, p. 528.

[10]*Ibid.*, p. 414.

[11]*Ibid.*, p. 403.

[12]*Ibid.*, p. 60.

[13]*Ibid.*, p. 129.

[14]*Ibid.*, p. 541.

[15]*Ibid.*, p. 541.

[16]*Virg. Puer.*, p. 142.

[17]*Collected Works of William Hazlitt,* edited by Waller and Glover, XII, p. 176. (References to Hazlitt's *Works* are to this edition.)

[18]*Virg. Puer.*, p. 105.

Hazlitt, "comes home to the bosoms and business of men."[19] "Talk," thinks Stevenson, should "keep close along the lines of humanity, near the bosoms and businesses of men."[20] "Battles, sieges, speeches in parliament seemed mere idle noise and fury," says Hazlitt, "compared with these mighty works and dreaded names that spoke to me in the eternal silence of thought"[21]; and Stevenson: "The shrill doctors and the plangent wars go by into ultimate silence and emptiness"[22]; "Our noisy years did indeed seem moments in the being of the eternal silence."[23]

When one turns from these remoter resemblances in the choice and use of literary ornament to specific imitations in individual thoughts and manners of expression, the evidence is so abundant that only a representative selection of illustrative examples can be given. Here identity of thought and similarity of expression will best be shown by setting parallelisms side by side.

Of idleness, which for each of them did "not consist in doing nothing, but in doing a great deal not recognized in the dogmatic formularies of the ruling class,"[24] that is, in doing what one will and in taking time for thought, they speak with equally enthusiastic approval, as of "business . . . . which would seem idle to you" but which for them is " 'very stuff of the conscience' "[25]:

We are absorbed in the present moment, . . . idling away a great deal of time in youth.[26]

An idler at school . . . is one who has high health and spirits, who has the free use of his limbs, with all his wits about him, who feels the circulation of his blood, . . . the open air in his face.[28]

It is surely beyond a doubt that people should be a good deal idle in youth.[27]

And meantime there goes the idler . . . He has had time to take care of his health and his spirits: he has been a great deal in the open air, which is the most salutary of all things for both mind and body.[29]

---

[19] *Works*, V, p. 1.
[20] *Mem. and Port.*, p. 141.
[21] *Works*, VI, p. 14.
[22] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 112.
[23] *Essays of Travel*, p. 117.
[24] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 103.
[25] *Works*, VI, p. 182.
[26] *Ibid.*, XII, p. 157.
[27] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 105.
[28] *Works*, VI, p. 72.
[29] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 111.

What I like best is to lie whole mornings on a sunny bank on Salisbury Plain, without any object before me, neither knowing nor caring how time passes, and thus . . . melt down hours to moments.[30]

He may pitch on some tuft of lilacs over a burn, and smoke innumerable pipes to the tune of the water on the stones.[31]

What I mean by living to one's-self is living in the world, as in it, not of it: . . . It is to be a silent spectator of the mighty scene of things, . . . to take a thoughtful anxious interest in . . . the affairs of men, calm, contemplative, passive, distant, touched with pity for their sorrows, smiling at their follies without bitterness, . . . not seeking their notice, nor once dreamt of by them.[32]

To sit and contemplate,—to remember the faces of women without desire, to be pleased by the great deeds of men without envy, to be everything and everywhere in sympathy, and yet content to remain where and what you are —is not this to know both wisdom and virtue, and to dwell with happiness?[33]

For excessive industry of the conventional sort, whether in business or at school, each expresses his profound contempt:

Some men are mere machines. They are put in a go-cart of business, and are harnessed to a profession — yoked to fortune's wheels. They plod on, and succeed. Their affairs conduct them, not they their affairs.[34]

There is a sort of dead-alive hackneyed people about, who are scarcely conscious of living except in the exercise of some conventional occupation. . . . They pass their hours in a sort of coma which are not dedicated to furious moiling in the gold mill.[35]

A lad with a sickly constitution, and no very active mind, . . . neither sagacity to distinguish nor spirit to enjoy for himself, will generally be at the head of his form. . . . The best capacities are as much above this drudgery, as the dullest are beneath it.[36]

Extreme *busyness*, whether at school or college, kirk or market, is a symptom of deficient vitality; and a faculty for idleness implies a catholic appetite and a strong sense of personal identity.[37]

[30] *Works*, XII, p. 58.
[31] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 107.
[32] *Works*, VI, p. 91.
[33] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 246.
[34] *Works*, VI, p. 102.
[35] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 113.
[36] *Works*, VI, p. 72.
[37] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 113

A mere scholar, who knows nothing but books, must be ignorant even of them.[38]

And if a man reads very hard, . . . he will have little time for thoughts.[39]

[He elects to] doze over a musty spelling book, repeat barbarous distichs after his master, sit so many hours pinioned to a writing-desk, and receive his reward for the loss of time and pleasure in paltry prize-medals at Christmas and Midsummer.[40]

It will not be the full, vivid, instructive hours of truantry that you regret; you would rather cancel some lack-lustre periods between sleep and waking in the class.[41]

"And notice," as Stevenson remarks of Hazlitt, "how learned" these two enthusiastic pedestrians are "in the theory of walking tours"[42]:

Give me the clear blue sky over my head, and the green turf beneath my feet, a winding road before, and a three hours' march to dinner—and then to thinking! . . . I laugh, I run, I leap, I sing for joy.[43]

Surely, of all possible moods, this, in which a man takes the road, is the best.[44]

The mere winding of the path is enough to enliven a long day's walk.[45]

The soul of a journey is liberty, perfect liberty, to think, feel, do, just as one pleases.[46]

Freedom is of the essence; because you should be able to stop and go on, and follow this way and that, as the freak takes you.[47]

I like to go by myself. . . . I cannot see the wit of walking and talking at the same time.[48]

Now, to be properly enjoyed, a walking tour should be gone upon alone. . . . There should be no cackle of voices at your elbow.[49]

Certain of their ideas about art, particularly letters and painting, show remarkable similarity:

In art, in taste, in life, in speech, you decide from feeling, and not from reason.[50]

Feeling is the law, and it is that which you must neither garble or belie.[51]

[38] *Works*, VI, p. 73.
[39] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 106.
[40] *Works*, VI, p. 72.
[41] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 106.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 238.
[43] *Works*, VI, p. 182.
[44] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 235.
[45] *Essays of Travel*, p. 104.
[46] *Works*, VI, p. 181.
[47] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 234.
[48] *Works*, VI, p. 181.
[49] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 234.
[50] *Works*, VI, p. 31.
[51] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 73.

I have not much pleasure in writing these Essays. . . . After I begin them, I am only anxious to get to the end of them. . . . I sometimes have to write them twice over; then it is necessary to read the *proof*; . . . so that by the time they appear in a tangible shape, . . . they have lost their gloss and relish, and become 'more tedious than a twice-told tale.'[52]

The practice of letters is miserably harassing to the mind; and after an hour or two's work, all the more human portion of an author is extinct; he will bully, backbite, and speak daggers. . . .

To find the right word is so doubtful a success and lies so near to failure, that there is no satisfaction in a year of it.[53]

'There is a pleasure in painting which none but painters know.' In writing, you have to contend with the world; in painting, you have only to carry on a friendly strife with Nature. You sit down to your task, and are happy. From the moment that you take up the pencil, and look Nature in the face, you are at peace with your own heart. . . . The mind is calm, and full at the same time. The hand and eye are equally employed. . . . You learn something every moment. . . . With every stroke of the brush, a new field of inquiry is laid open; new difficulties and new triumphs are prepared over them.[54]

But painting, on the contrary, is often highly sedative; because so much of the labour . . . is almost entirely manual, and of that skilled sort of manual labour which offers a continual series of successes, and so tickles a man, through his vanity, into good humour. . . .

Again, painters may work out of doors; and the fresh air, the deliberate seasons, and the 'tranquillising influence' of the green earth, counterbalance the fever of thought, and keep them cool, placable, and prosaic.[55]

Quite perfectly Stevenson restates the fine philosophy of *The Spirit of Obligations,* which essay, as I have already shown, had been an actual "turning point" in his life:

We are thankful for good-will rather than for services, for the motive than the *quantum* of favour received—a kind word or

Is there not a thought of gratitude in your heart for certain other benefactors who set you smiling when they fall in your

---

[52]*Works,* VI, p. 6.
[53]*Virg. Puer.,* pp. 18-20.
[54]*Works,* VI, pp. 5-7.
[55]*Virg. Puer.,* pp. 19-20.

look is never forgotten, while we cancel prouder and weightier obligations. . . .

There are different modes of obligation. . . . A man may lend his countenance who will not part with his money, and open his mind to us who will not draw out his purse. . . .

The person, whose doors I enter with most pleasure . . . never did me the smallest favour.[56]

way, or season your dinner with good company? . . . Hazlitt mentions that he was more sensible of obligation to Northcote, who never had done him anything he could call a service, than to his whole circle of ostentatious friends; for he thought a good companion emphatically the greatest benefactor. . . .

There is no duty we so much understate as the duty of being happy. By being happy, we sow anonymous benefits upon the world.[57]

Their musings about life and death and the proper attitude with respect to these mysterious realities show many parallels:

He [Coleridge] complained in particular of the presumption of [Godwin's] attempting to establish the future immortality of man, 'without (as he said) knowing what Death or what Life was.'[58]

We have no idea what death is . . .; there is not a man on earth who has flown so high into abstractions as to have any practical guess at the meaning of the word *life*[59]

To believe in immortality is one thing, but it is first needful to believe in life.[60]

The love of life is in fact the sum of all our passions and of all our enjoyments.[61]

The love of life, then, is an habitual attachment, not an abstract principle. Simply *to be* does not 'content man's natural desire'; we long to be in a certain time, place, and circumstance.[62]

The love of Life and the fear of Death are two famous phrases that grow harder to understand the more we think about them.[63]

We do not, properly speaking, love life at all, but living.[64]

---

[56]*Works*, VII, pp. 81-85.
[57]*Virg. Puer.*, pp. 116-117.
[58]*Works*, XII, p. 264.
[59]*Virg. Puer.*, p. 153.
[60]*Mem. and Port.*, p. 40.
[61]*Works*, I, p. 2.
[62]*Ibid.*, VI, p. 324.
[63]*Virg. Puer.*, p. 152.
[64]*Ibid.*, p. 154.

No young man ever thinks he shall die.[65]

We do not leave so great a void in society as we are inclined to imagine.[66]

The effeminate clinging to life as such, as a general or abstract idea, is the effect of a highly civilized and artificial state of society.[69]

It is, perhaps, better, as well as more heroical, to strike at some daring or darling object, and if we fail in that, to take the consequences manfully, than to renew the lease of a tedious, spiritless, charmless existence.[71]

'Let us march therefore intrepidly wherever we are led by the course of human accidents.'[73]

One can do a great deal in a short time if one only knows how. . . . I can easily understand how the old divines and controversialists produced their folios; I could write folios myself if I rose early and sat up late at this kind of occupation.[75]

The length of man's life, which is endless to the brave and busy, is scorned by his ambitious thought.[67]

The ranks of life are full. . . . You may take it how you will, but the services of no single individual are indispensable.[68]

Surely the love of living is stronger in an Alpine climber . . . than in a creature who lives upon a diet and walks a measured distance in the interest of his constitution.[70]

It is better to lose health like a spendthrift than to waste it like a miser. It is better to live and be done with it, than to die daily in the sick room.[72]

There is but one conclusion possible: that a man should stop s ears against paralysing terror, and run the race that is set before him with a single mind.[74]

By all means begin your folio; even if the doctor does not give you a year, even if he hesitates about a month, make one brave push and see what can be accomplished in a week.[76]

From the foregoing acknowledgments of Stevenson and exhibit of parallel passages, the fact of a somewhat extraordinary relationship between Hazlitt and Stevenson is

---

[65] *Works*, VI, p. 324.
[66] *Ibid.*, VI, p. 327.
[67] *Mem. and Port.*, p. 40.
[68] *Virg. Puer.*, pp. 120-121.
[69] *Works*, VI, p. 328.
[70] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 155.
[71] *Works*, VI, p. 329.
[72] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 161.
[73] *Works*, VI, p. 100.
[74] *Virg Puer.*, p. 157.
[75] *Works*, VII, pp. 60-61.
[76] *Virg. Puer.*, pp. 161-162.

perhaps sufficiently established. We may turn now to inquire into the nature of this kinship, as manifest in their lives, their personalities, and their respective styles.

For in these widely separated lives there were circumstances not entirely dissimilar that have some causal significance in connection with other and more striking similarities in their characters and writings. Each expended his youthful energies in the direction of his father's profession, Stevenson soon finding himself even less qualified to be a lighthouse-engineer than Hazlitt had found himself fitted to be a Unitarian preacher. His striking out into law, if somewhat more resolute than his perfunctory visits to Skerryvore, proved wholly unsatisfying to Stevenson and soon drove him into wedlock with literary art. Just so fled Hazlitt from the austerity and uncertainties of preaching to the unchanging satisfactions of art when he embraced with vigor and enthusiasm the profession of painting. Here, in this land of their hearts' desire, despite occasional murmurings, both found the atmosphere congenial and their labors full of joy. Yet here each practically met with failure in his most ambitious attempts, the one in painting and the other in verse; and here, falling short of the highest, each achieved enduring success in the more pedestrian art of prose. But even in prose, neither attained to mastery without persevering drudgery and infinite pains. Stevenson's "penny version-book" is well known. In his letters he says: "I frankly believe (thanks to my dire industry) I have done more with smaller gifts than almost any man of letters in the world."[77] The corresponding difficulties over which Hazlitt triumphed may be gathered from these words: "I sat down to the task shortly afterward for the twentieth time, got new pens and paper, determined to make clear work of it, wrote a few meagre sentences, . . . stopped half-way down the second page; and, after trying in vain to pump up any words, images, notions, apprehensions, facts, or observations, . . . gave up the attempt as labour in vain, and shed tears of

[77]Balfour, *Life of Robert Louis Stevenson*, II, p. 199.

helpless despondency on the blank unfinished paper. I can write fast enough now."[78] Then, too, Hazlitt was usefully identified with the English romanticists of the early nineteenth century, as Stevenson was the chief English romancer of its last two decades. Stevenson certainly shared Hazlitt's lifelong yearning "to see some prospect of good to mankind, . . . to leave some sterling work behind, . . . to have some friendly hand to consign"[79] him to the grave; and his last words might have been those of Hazlitt, "Well, I have had a happy life."[80]

In temperament and character they were more alike than is commonly supposed. One has only to set together their youthful portraits to discover suggestions of spiritual kinship in the delicately oval contour of the face, the sensitive mouth, the long, dark hair, the bright and earnest eyes. Each possessed an original and clear-thinking mind. Abstract principles, the truths of personal experience, the problems of human life, the principles of art and conduct —upon such matters both delighted to meditate and to argue. Cant and shams of every sort disgusted them. To each "how good" was "man's life, the mere living!" Yet life was something to be spent freely and happily, not hoarded up; and death was not a thing to dread,—was not to be allowed to paralyze one's efforts or, indeed, "to take so much as one illusion"[81] from the heart. Each believed in the high duty of being happy and of radiating happiness, although they practiced this doctrine with very different degrees of success. Both rebelled against the serfdom of conventional, money-making occupations and gloried in the name of idler—all the while busying themselves unflaggingly about their self-chosen art, as the enormous and painstakingly elaborated output from their pens attests. They were lovers of nature, and of solitary rambling along winding roads. They were brilliant and untiring conversation-

---

[78] *Works*, XII, pp. 266-267.
[79] *Works*, VI, pp. 325-326.
[80] P. P. Howe, *Life of William Hazlitt*, 1923, p. 426.
[81] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 163.

alists, whose talk, like that of Coleridge, was "far above singing."[82] Listen to Stevenson's delightful invitation to Henley to "sit down here for twenty years, with a packet of tobacco and a drink, and talk of art and women,"[83] and read Colvin's tribute beginning, "It was only in talk . . . that all the many lights and colours of this richly compounded spirit could be seen in full play."[84] "The true talk," says Stevenson, describing admirably the case of Hazlitt as well as his own, "that strikes out all the slumbering best of us, comes only with the peculiar brethren of our spirits, is founded as deep as love in the constitution of our being, and is a thing to relish with all our energy, while yet we have it, and to be grateful for for ever."[85] As for Hazlitt, we have Talfourd's word that "when he began to talk, he could not be mistaken for a common man . . . . When he became entirely at ease, and entered upon a favorite topic, no one's conversation was ever more delightful. He did not talk for effect, to dazzle, or surprise, or annoy, but with the most simple and honest desire to make his view of the subject entirely apprehended by his hearers."[86] Said Lamb, "I think I shall go to my grave without finding, or expecting to find, such another companion."[87] It may be said that both were egotists, for they constantly looked into their own hearts and minds and revealed with the utmost sincerity and truth the facts of their experience; and yet with modesty and even self-depreciation. In the broader sense of the term, both men were poets; for they were idealists ever, rose to the height of apprehending ideal and eternal beauty in nature and in human life, and into their finer passages infused "that heat and height of sane emotion which," as Stevenson puts it, "we agree to call by the name

---

[82]*Works*, VI, p. 183.
[83]*Letters*, II, p. 236.
[84]*Letters*, Methuen Ed., I. p. xxxvii.
[85]*Mem. and Port.*, p. 157.
[86]Howe, W. D., *Selections from Hazlitt*, p. xli.
[87]*Ibid.*, p. xl.

of poetry."[88] In the best sense of the word, both were sentimentalists, as Montaigne had been before them. And both were romanticists, the one primarily of mood, the other of incident and place and mood. In each there was something of the artist, the philosopher, and the preacher; but a preacher quite unconventional and independent, who emphasized the importance of living happily and manfully here and of allowing the Lord to "have a care of his soul."[89]

Resembling one another to a considerable extent in personality, convictions, and spiritual experience, as essayists they quite naturally exhibit a similarity of thought and style. As has already been suggested in another connection, their essays deal alike with moods, experiences, travels, observations upon nature, character, and conduct, their topics and particular reflections often being practically identical. Always the personal is prominent, giving warmth and charm to even their more abstruse dissertations. Their pages glow with vivid reminiscences of shining moments that men do not willingly let die. A tinge of antiquarianism—the love of old books and ancient places characteristic of Lamb—is to be met with in their essays here and there, as is also that other phase of the romantic which reveals the wonder of the commonplace and the familiar. Each essayist was a free and happy borrower, both of basic ideas and of illustrative quotations and allusions. Each is capable of pleasant fanciful conceptions, which, however, seldom reach to an imaginative flight. In neither does one meet with sound and fury, signifying nothing. "I hate to see a load of band-boxes go along the street," said Hazlitt, "and I hate to see a parcel of big words without anything in them."[90] And Stevenson has much to say in favor of pithiness, of avoiding the *cheville*.[91] Both exert themselves to "make clear work"[92] of their expression, but evince a

---

[88] *Mem. and Port.*, p. 255.
[89] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 159.
[90] *Works*, VI, p. 244.
[91] *The Art of Writing*, p. 258.

fondness for epigram and paradox. Their words have dignity and propriety, and are very largely drawn from the native stock. Provincialisms, slang, the obsolete, the archaic, the empty, and the gaudy they alike abhorred. In different measures they achieved a conversational ease. Within the limits of propriety determined by their times, like Montaigne each "had the courage to say as an author what he felt as a man."[92]

But in tracing those characteristics that rendered Hazlitt and Stevenson spiritual and literary kinsmen, one does not forget that there were also decided differences that serve to individualize and to differentiate them as writers and as men. Hazlitt's openness is sometimes utter and unashamed, approaching that of Montaigne; in Stevenson there was a degree of reticence in confidences about the deeper experiences of life. For the strong prejudices of Hazlitt, we find in Stevenson "a great and cool allowance for all sorts of people and opinions."[93] The one was ill-tempered, quarrelsome, and capable of hating as fervently as he loved; the other, while not incapable of bursts of indignation, was habitually sweet and kindly, the most attractive and lovable of men. The one imagined that all men were conspiring against him, and so retained unbrokenly to the end of his life the friendship of no one but Lamb; the other attracted and held the love of all who knew him, Samoans and Englishmen alike. In Stevenson there was a deep and genuine humor; in Hazlitt, hardly a trace. Hazlitt was characteristically a man of moods, of reflection; Stevenson, potentially and essentially a man of action. Compare Hazlitt's "food, warmth, sleep and a book"[94] with Stevenson's "First, good health: secondly, a small competence: and thirdly, O Du Lieber Gott! friends."[95] When Wordsworth, Coleridge, and others who shared with Hazlitt the intoxicating enthusiasm for liberty,

---

[92]*Works*, VIII, p. 92.
[93]*Virg. Puer.*, p. 112.
[94]*Works*, XII, p. 321.
[95]Balfour, *Life of Robert Louis Stevenson*, I, p. 133.

equality, and fraternity recanted and sank back into conservatism and convention, Hazlitt alone stood unbudgingly by the ideals and ideas and enthusiasms of his youth—"to the end of the chapter."[96] Stevenson, who also glorified youth and even carried a certain boyishness with him always, made much less of consistency: "To hold the same views at forty as we held at twenty is to have been stupefied for a score of years."[97] Optimism, while not wholly wanting in Hazlitt, was much more abounding in Stevenson. By no means did he agree with Hazlitt that "the mind soars by an effort to the grand and lofty: it is at home, in the grovelling, the disagreeable, and the little."[98] "There are a few superior, happy beings," admitted Hazlitt, "who are born with a temper exempt from every trifling annoyance. This spirit sits serene and smiling as in its native skies, and a divine harmony (whether heard or not) plays around them."[98] And the words are quite as applicable to Stevenson as they are inapplicable to their author.

As essayists also they are quite distinct; no one could possibly mistake the one style for the other. Stevenson expressed a truth when he said, "We cannot write like Hazlitt." He himself wrote both better and worse. One must allow that Hazlitt has the greater ruggedness and force, the greater simplicity and perspicuity of style. In his opinion, "to write a genuine familiar or truly English style, is to write as one would speak in common conversation, who had a thorough command and choice of words, or who could discourse with ease, force and perspicuity, setting aside all pedantic and oratorical flourishes."[99] Stevenson believed "that style . . . the most perfect, not, as fools say, which is the most natural, for the most natural is the disjointed babble of the chronicler; but which attains the highest degree of elegant and pregnant implication unobtrusively; or if obtrusively, then with the greatest gain

---

[96] *Works*, XII, p. 326.
[97] *Virg. Puer.*, p. 88.
[98] *Works*, XII, p. 160.
[99] *Works*, VI, p. 242.

to sense and vigour."[100] Naturally, their prose reveals these opposite tendencies, the one toward simplicity, the other toward elaboration. The one relies primarily upon the truthfulness and force of what he has to say; the other, to some extent, upon the cleverness with which his meaning is conveyed. Stevenson loved "the art of words"; and few have manipulated words with greater skill. His adventures in diction are more daring than Hazlitt's. Certainly he could not say with Hazlitt, "I am fastidious in this respect, and would almost as soon coin the currency of the realm as counterfeit the King's English."[101] Nor is his diction as free as Hazlitt's from words that are skin-tight in their precision and "owe their signification and point to technical or professional allusions."[102] In the structure of the sentence and of the larger units of composition there is the greater tendency in Stevenson toward the novel and the artificial; as appears in the emphasis that he places upon the devices of suspense and solution, antithesis, balance, alliteration, and assonance in general. Hear Hazlitt denounce "sweeping clauses, periods that unite the Poles, forced alliterations, astounding antitheses."[103] In such elements of style as are essentially artificial, we must allow that Stevenson had the finer mastery. Always he wrought with his eye upon the matter and the artistic design. To his mind, "pattern and argument live in each other."[104] He speaks much of the web of composition—"a web at once sensuous and logical, an elegant and pregnant texture: that is style, that is the foundation of the art of literature."[105] In this adherence to an elaborate pattern, and in the use of fresh and concrete expressions, Stevenson excelled. His is also the more elegant, the more allusive and connotative style. Most obvious of all these differentiating qualities of style are Stevenson's never-failing

---

[100]*The Art of Writing*, p. 259.
[101]*Works*, VI, p. 244.
[102]*Ibid.*, VI, p. 243.
[103]*Ibid.*, VI, p. 246.
[104]*The Art of Writing*, p. 258.
[105]*Ibid.*, p. 259.

humor and good cheer. Hazlitt is often somber, cross, and pessimistic; whereas a valiant optimism and a rich and kindly sense of humor are deeply imbedded, not only in Stevenson's nature, but also in the theory and the practice of his art. "No art," he said, "was ever perfect, and not many noble, that has not been mirthfully conceived. And no man, it may be added, was ever anything but a wet blanket and a cross to his companions who boasted not a copious spirit of enjoyment."[106]

Finally, we may undertake to sum up the obligations which Stevenson, and all the hosts who delight in Stevenson, owe to him whose mantle of familiar style seems to have fallen upon the shoulders of his Scotch disciple. In being as generous to Hazlitt in these conclusions as facts seem to warrant, we shall be following the example of Stevenson himself. Furthermore, in making these acknowledgments, we lose no whit of admiration for the later essayist; for we believe with Stevenson that "passion, wisdom, creative force, the power of mystery or colour, are allotted in the hour of birth, and can be neither learned nor simulated"[107]; and we have found in each of these essayists abundantly original and distinctive gifts of style.

Hazlitt, then, was virtually Stevenson's father in the form of essay established by Montaigne. Stevenson, as was said at the outset, found "a lot of style in Hazlitt," and labored diligently and long, and not without a sense of failure, "to write like Hazlitt." In the matter of style, he ultimately excelled his master in certain respects but never quite came up with him in others. To the "Hazlitt shelf"[108] he turned, not only for a model of familiar style, but for a companion-volume on a journey, for models of criticism, and for guidance in the art of living bravely, happily, effectively. How much the Hazlitt essays contributed to the cheerful and manly philosophy that sustained Stevenson in happy and successful industry under the long handicap of

---

[106]*Across the Plains*, p. 142.
[107]*The Art of Writing*, p. 278.
[108]*Letters*, IV, p. 292.

wretched health, it is impossible to estimate. It seems quite certain, however, that but for Hazlitt many of Stevenson's most delightful essays would never have been written; that many of his happiest ideas about the subjects chosen would never have been expressed. Hazlitt at one time he "thumbed and studied,"[109] and in defense of his method of imitation he says: "Perhaps I hear some one cry out: But this is not the way to be original! It is not; nor is there any way but to be born so. Nor yet, if you are born original, is there anything in this training that shall clip the wings of your originality. There can be none more original than Montaigne, neither could any be more unlike Cicero; yet no craftsman can fail to see how much the one tried in his time to imitate the other."[110] The statement describes exactly enough his own practice in making use of Hazlitt. Subjects for essays, trains of ideas upon these subjects, quotations, allusions, certain qualities of style, happy phrasings of particular thoughts—all these elements of literary kinship with Hazlitt are apparent in the essays of Stevenson; how strikingly, one does not realize until a comparison has been made.

---

[109]*Mem. and Port.*, p. 212.
[110]*Ibid.*, pp. 59-60.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON LOWELL

BY KILLIS CAMPBELL

I

The following additions should be made to the lists of Lowell's published writings as recorded by his bibliographers:[1]

(1) "Lover's Drink Song," a lyric of twenty-four lines published in the *Southern Literary Messenger* for June, 1840 (VI, p. 469). The poem is unsigned, but that it is the work of Lowell is established by a letter of the poet to G. B. Loring (written May 17, 1840, and now preserved among the Lowell MSS. at Harvard), in which the poem is quoted in full, and also by the fact that an autograph copy of it appears among the cancelled matter in the printer's pressroom copy of *A Year's Life* (now in the J. Pierpont Morgan Library in New York City.)[2]

(2) "The New England Convention," an editorial published in the *Anti-Slavery Standard* of June 4, 1846. This essay is signed with the letter "L," the signature employed by the poet with his article on "Daniel Webster" in the *Standard* of July 2, 1846, which was formally accredited

---

[1]The list of Lowell's writings that most nearly approximates completeness is that of Mr. George Willis Cooke in his *Bibliography of James Russell Lowell* (Boston, 1906), pp. 7-71, a list of single titles arranged alphabetically, with the place and date of publication (and of republication, if any) of each item. This list is obviously of the highest importance to the student of Lowell bibliography. Very valuable, too, is the bibliography published by H. E. Scudder in his *James Russell Lowell: A Biography* (Boston, 1901), II, pp. 421-427, a list arranged in chronological order and giving only the place and date of first publication of each item recorded. Of high value also is the bibliography of Chamberlain (J. C.) and Livingston (L. S.), *First Editions of the Writings of James Russell Lowell* (New York, 1914), though this includes only items that appeared as separate volumes or pamphlets or leaflets or in some volume (as an annual or memorial volume) other than a newspaper or magazine.

[2]See Chamberlain and Livingston, p. 7.

to him in an editorial note in the *Standard* of August 27, 1846. It is further authenticated as Lowell's by a reference to it in a letter (now in the Lowell Collection at Harvard) by Sydney B. Gay, editor-in-chief of the *Standard* at the time. In this letter, which is dated May 22, 1846, Gay specifies the subject of the editorial and makes it clear that it was the first of the long line of editorials that Lowell was to contribute to the *Standard.*[3]

(3) "One Idea," an editorial published in the *Anti-Slavery Standard* of September 17, 1846. This, like the last-mentioned item, is subscribed with the poet's initial, and is entirely in the Lowell manner.

(4) "A Pepysian Letter," published in *Holden's Dollar Magazine* for June, 1849 (III, pp. 380-382). This letter is a rambling commentary on certain of the poet's neighbors (whom he mentions by name), on his journeyings back and forth between Cambridge and Boston, on his recent literary activities, on his connection with the "Town and Country Club" (predecessor of the famous "Saturday Club"), and on the unhappy impressions made by Emerson in a lecture he had lately given at the Cambridge Lyceum. It concludes with some twenty lines of doggerel, improvised, so the poet tells us, for the entertainment of his children. The letter was originally addressed to Lowell's friend, C. F. Briggs, then editor of *Holden's,* who confesses in a brief editorial preface that he had published it without its author's permission. It involves a strange betrayal of confidence, and doubtless got the poet into hot water. That the letter was written by Lowell is reasonably plain from its style and content, but its authenticity is completely established by a later letter of Lowell to Briggs, of November 25, 1849 (now in the Harvard collection).

(5) A note of one paragraph in the New York *Nation* of January 27, 1870 (X, p. 59), criticising an etymology proposed by Sir George Bowyer in a London paper. That

---

[3]Scudder is in error in holding *(l.c.,* I, p. 201) that Lowell's editorial on Webster *(Anti-Slavery Standard,* July 2, 1846) was the first of his "prose contributions to the *Standard.*"

this is Lowell's is made clear by his reference to it in a latter of January 24, 1870, to E. L. Godkin (see Lowell's *Letters,* ed. Norton, II, p. 54).[4]

II

To the list of places of first publication recorded by Cooke in his *Bibliography of Lowell* (pp. 7-71) the following additions are to be made:

(1) "Aladdin," recorded by Cooke as first published in *Under the Willows* in 1868, appeared in *Putnam's Magazine for* June, 1853 (I, p. 688), being a part of the third installment of "Our Own."

(2) "The Changeling," recorded by Cooke as first published in *Poems,* 1849, appeared in *Poems,* Second Series, 1848.

(3) "Death of Queen Mercedes," recorded by Cooke as first published in *Heartsease and Rue,* 1888, appeared in *Harper's Magazine* for January, 1881 (LXII, p. 250).

(4) "The Departed," recorded by Cooke as first published in *A Year's Life,* 1841, appeared in the *Southern Literary Messenger* for May, 1840 (VI, pp. 366-7).[5]

(5) "The Fountain," recorded by Cooke as first published in *Poems,* 1849, appeared in the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* of February 16, 1843, and also in *Poems,* 1844.

---

[4]This item is of little importance in itself, but is significant as showing that Lowell was an occasional contributor to the *Nation* at this time. See also *Letters,* II, p. 76, for reference to a request made by Godkin for a review of Taine's *English Literature,* a request which, apparently, Lowell did not comply with. Did Lowell, perhaps, write the review of Tennyson's *The Holy Grail, and Other Poems* in the *Nation* of February 17, 1870, and possibly also the article on "The Drama in Colleges" in the *Nation* of January 6, 1870?

Another scrap of Lowell's of which no bibliographical record has been made, a signed note prefacing a quotation from one of the dramas of John Webster, appeared in the *Anti-Slavery Standard* for March 31, 1841.

[5]"Forgetfulness," which according to Cooke was first published in the *Anti-Slavery Standard,* September 7, 1843, but which Scudder *(Life of Lowell,* II, p. 426) declares to have been published at some time prior to this in the New York *Mirror,* appeared in the *Mirror* for July 1, 1843 (II, p. 198).

(6) "On the Death of Charles Turner Torrey," recorded by Cooke as first published in *Poems,* 1848, appeared in the *Boston Courier* of May 23, 1846.

(7) "The Sower," recorded by Cooke as first published in *Poems,* 1849, appeared in the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* of November 16, 1849.

(8) "To H. W. L. on his Birthday," recorded by Cooke as first published in *Under the Willows,* 1869, first appeared in the *Boston Daily Advertiser* of February 27, 1867.

(9) "To M. W. on her Birthday," recorded by Cooke as first published in *Poems,* 1844, appeared in the *Dial,* January, 1842 (III, p. 359), under the title "To Irene on her Birthday."

(10) "With a Pressed Flower," recorded by Cooke as first published in *Poems,* 1849, appeared in *A Year's Life,* 1841.[6]

III

Among other unrecorded variant versions the following may be noted:

(1) "Anne," in the *New Mirror,* April 20, 1844 (III, p. 39).

(2) "The Debate in the Sennit" (No. 5 of the first series of the *Biglow Paper,* in the *National Anti-Slavery Standard,* May 11, 1848.

(3) "The Fiery Trial," "The Heritage," the sonnet beginning "My Love, I have no fear that thou shouldst die," and "To M. W. on her Birthday," in Griswold's *The Poets and Poetry of America* (1847).

(4) "Letter from Mr. Ezekiel Biglow to the Hon. Joseph T. Buckingham" (No. 1 of the first series of the *Biglow Pa-*

---

[6]"Arcadia Rediviva," which, according to Cooke, was first published in *Heartsease and Rue,* 1888, appears to have been published in some foreign periodical in 1881 or thereabouts: see a letter of John Holmes *(Letters of John Holmes,* p. 191) of March 25, 1881, in which Holmes says he has seen Lowell's lines "In Arcadia" *(sic)* in a number of the *Parisian.*

pers), in the *National Anti-Slavery Standard,* June 25, 1846.[7]

(5) The sonnet beginning "The hope of truth grows stronger day by day," in the *National Anti-Slavery Standard,* August 6, 1846, under the title "The Power of Truth."

(6) "With a Pressed Flower," in *A Year's Life,* 1841.

---

[7]That the reprinting of this number of the *Biglow Papers* was authorized by Lowell is established by one of his letters to Gay *(Letters,* I, p. 115).